NUMBERS

A HELPING HAND
FOR
BIBLE STUDENTS

EPIPHANY STUDIES
IN THE
SCRIPTURES

"The Path of the just is as the Shining Light,
That Shineth More and More
Unto the Perfect Day."

SERIES VIII

NUMBERS
(Chapters 1-10; 26)

14,000 Edition

"For the Law Having a Shadow of Good Things to Come, and not the Very Image of the Things (Heb. 10:1). These Things are Types of Us. .All These Things happened unto Them Typically . . . Behold Israel after the Flesh (1 Cor. 10: 6, 18, - I. V.). He shall Be for a Sanctuary; but for a Stone of Stumbling and for a Rock of Offense to Both the Houses of Israel (Is. 8: 14,- 1. V.).

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON
PHILADELPHIA, PA., U. S. A.
1938

To the King of Kings and Lord of Lords

IN THE INTEREST OF

HIS CONSECRATED SAINTS,

WAITING FOR THE ADOPTION,

—AND OF—

"ALL THAT IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE LORD,"

"THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH;"

—AND OF—

THE GROANING CREATION, TRAVAILING AND WAITING FOR

THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SONS OF GOD,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED.

"To make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God," "Wherein He hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of the times He might gather together in one all things, under Christ."
Eph. 3: 4, 5, 9; 1: 8-10.

COPYRIGHT 1938

By PAUL S. L. JOHNSON

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD.

IN THE Foreword of Volume III are given the Scriptural and factual proofs on what Scriptures are to be considered typical. Among these is one setting forth the fact that direct Bible statements to the effect that a fact, a book or a set of books are typical is a proof of their being typical. A comparison of Heb. 10: 1 and Gal. 4: 21, 22, combined with very many typical allusions to many pertinent events, proves that the entire Pentateuch, which is in the Hebrew Bible called the Law, hence every person, principle and thing therein referred to, are typical. This, therefore, proves that the persons, principles and things referred to in the book of Numbers are typical. This fact is the basis of the way that the book of Numbers will be treated in this and several subsequent volumes of this work; for it will be studied from the standpoint of type and antitype. In harmony with the passages quoted on our frontispage, Israel, as treated in Numbers, is viewed as a type of the Christian Church, nominal and real. And from this standpoint Num. 1—10; 26 are treated in this volume.

It had at first been our thought to treat of about half of Numbers in this volume, but that would have made the book contain about 1,000 pages-too much for a volume of this work. Accordingly, we decided to treat herein only that part of Numbers which deals with the organization of nominal and real Fleshly Israel, as typical of the organization of nominal and real Spiritual Israel, as holy nations. Hence this book treats of Num. 1—10; 26 only. This means that part of the rest of Numbers will be treated in Volume IX, and the remainder in a volume subsequent to Volume X. The propriety of discussing Num. 11—14; 31 in Volume IX, which will treat of the Parousia Messenger, will become apparent from the fact that he is repeatedly involved in the antitypes of these chapters. *D.v.*, there will be another volume of this series than Volume IX devoted to the Parousia Messenger, since very many other Scriptures, yea, whole books, set forth his work typically. Additionally, *D.v.,* there will be at least two volumes of this work devoted to an exposition of the book of Revelation. Accordingly, this series of books will, *D.v.*, contain at least fourteen volumes.

We have several reasons for writing so detailedly on Numbers. One of these is our general mission of supplementing

the Parousia Messenger's Biblical expositions, so as to interpret those Scriptures that he did not expound, or expounded merely in their generalities, that thus between him and ourself the whole Bible (Rom. 15: 4) will be understood as due by the Church before it leaves the world. Again, in order to put the Church into the position of knowing the pertinent events of Church history necessary as a foundation for the study of the book of Revelation, we have been treating of Numbers, and expect to treat of Deuteronomy (with less detail, however), since these two books type much of what Revelation symbolizes. This relation of these two Mosaic books to Revelation is symbolized by the pillar in the Most Holy typing the book of Revelation being on the same side of the Most Holy as the two corner boards typing these two books, the Revelation-symbolizing pillar being flush against the middle third of the Numbers-symbolizing board. This position shows that Numbers is even more related to Revelation than Deuteronomy.

The proper study of this book will strengthen the conviction of the humble, meek, hungry, honest and good among the consecrated that some of the marvelous depths and riches of God's wisdom and knowledge has in a typical way been stored up for the due time in the book of Numbers. It will also greatly increase his knowledge and appreciation of God's Character, Word and Works. And all this will conduce to his increased glorifying God, benefiting others and profiting himself. It was, among other things, the design of writing this book to secure these ends. We trust that all who read and study it will join with the author in prayer for these results.

Your Brother and Servant,
PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, PA.,
July 16, 1938.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.
GOSPEL-AGE ISRAELITES.
Num. 1; 2; 26.

GENERALITIES ON THE GOSPEL-AGE ISRAELITES. DETAILS ON THE GOSPEL-AGE ISRAELITES. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 7

CHAPTER II.
GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES.
Num. 3; 4.

GENERALITIES ON THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. GERSHONITES. KOHATHITES. MERARITES. COVERING THE VESSELS AND FURNITURE. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 27

CHAPTER III.
GOSPEL-AGE SINNERS AND NAZARITES.
Num. 5; 6.

THREE CLASSES OF GOSPEL-AGE SINNERS. CHURCH SINNERS. THE GOSPEL-AGE NAZARITES. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 109

CHAPTER IV.
THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES.
Num. 7: 1-29.

THEIR JOINT OFFERINGS. THE OFFERINGS OF ANTITYPICAL NAHSHON. OF ANTITYPICAL NETHANEEL. OF ANTITYPICAL ELIAB. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 169

CHAPTER V.
THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES
(CONTINUED).
Num. 7: 30-47.

THE OFFERING OF ANTITYPICAL ELIZUR. OF ANTITYPICAL SHELUMIEL. OF ANTITYPICAL ELIASAPH. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 225

CHAPTER VI.
THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES
(CONTINUED).
Num. 7: 48-65.

THE OFFERINGS OF ANTITYPICAL ELISHAMA. OF ANTITYPICAL GAMALIEL. OF ANTITYPICAL ABIDAN. BEREAN QUESTIONS. . 297

CHAPTER VII.
THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES
(CONCLUDED).
Num. 7: 66—Num. 8: 4.

THE OFFERINGS OF ANTITYPICAL AHIEZER. OF ANTITYPICAL PAGIEL. OF ANTITYPICAL AHIRA. A SUMMARY OF THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES. THE GOSPEL-AGE MOSES AND AARON AS TRUTH RECEIVER AND GIVER. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 381

CHAPTER VIII.
CLEANSING, CONSECRATION AND SERVICE OF
THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES.
Num. 8: 5-26.

THE CLEANSING OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. THE CONSECRATION OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. THE FACTS OF THE CLEANSING AND CONSECRATION OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. THE SERVICE OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 481

CHAPTER IX.
TWO PASSOVERS AND THE FIERY,
CLOUDY PILLAR.
Num. 9.

THE GOSPEL-AGE PASSOVER THE MILLENNIAL-AGE PASSOVER THE CLOUDY PILLAR THE FIERY PILLAR. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 603

CHAPTER X
THE GOSPEL-AGE TRUMPETS AND MARCHES.
Num. 10.

THE TWO GOSPEL-AGE TRUMPETS. THEIR USES. THEIR USERS. GOSPEL-AGE MARCHES. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 659

CHAPTER I.
GOSPEL-AGE ISRAELITES.
Num. 1; 2; 26.

GENERALITIES ON THE GOSPEL AGE ISRAELITES. DETAILS ON THE GOSPEL AGE ISRAELITES. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

ALL of us are familiar with the fact that typical characters are often used to represent various antitypes, *e.g.*, Esau is used to represent the secondary elect classes: (1) nominal Fleshly Israel (Rom. 9: 10-13); (2) nominal Spiritual Israel (Is. 63: 1-6; Obad. 1-21); and (3) the Great Company (Heb. 12: 16, 17). Jacob is another case to the point, typing (1) real Fleshly Israel (Obad. 10: 18), (2) real Spiritual Israel (Rom. 9: 10-13). This principle applies to Jacob's wives, Leah (*wild cow*) and Rachel (*ewe*): the former represents (1) Nominal Fleshly Israel and their promises; (2) nominal Spiritual Israel and their promises; and (3) certain stewardship truths and the servants who applied them to developing sects; while Rachel represents (1) real Fleshly Israel and their promises; (2) real Spiritual Israel and their promises (Ruth 4: 11; Jer. 31: 15; Matt. 2: 18; Z' 81, 1-7; Berean Comments); and (3) certain stewardship truths and the servants who apply them to develop the Little Flock and Great Company. Taking Leah and Rachel as typing certain truths and the servants who apply them as pertinent to the third sets of definitions just given, we find some very interesting things typed in Gen. 29: 31—30: 25; 35: 16-18. In these stories Jacob represents the servants of Truth by the Divine Word giving life (1 Kings 17: 17-24) to good movements among God's nominal and real people during the Gospel Age. The setting of the story is after Jacob's flight from Esau, which types how the Lord's servants during and just after the Harvest of the Jewish Age fled from persecuting Fleshly Israel. Laban represents the

leaders, "the clergy," among the nominal people of God during the Gospel Age. As Jacob faithfully served Laban, so the true servants of God between the Harvests served the leaders of nominal Spiritual Israel. As Jacob served Laban for Rachel, but by deception first received Leah, so the real servants of God expected to be joined to the truths and the servants who would apply them to the real people of God, for gaining fruits in service, but were deceived by being first joined to the truths and the servants who applied them to building sects for the nominal people of God with which and whom to gain fiuits in service. Only later were they united to the truths and the servants who applied them to the real people of God, which truths and servants, however, remained barren so far as concerns producing a fruitful movement of the true people of God as such, until in 1846 the cleansing of the sanctuary was complete, when the beginning of such a movement (Joseph) set in. Bilhah (*timid*), Rachel's maid, seems to represent a set of Christian truths, related to antitypical Rachel, and the servants who applied them to building up two sects which leaned much toward Little Flock matters; while Zilpah (*dropping*) represents certain truths and the servants who applied them to building two sects nearer the Little Flock than the sects pictured by Leah's children.

(2) By Leah Jacob had six sons and one daughter, by Bilhah two sons, by Zilpah two sons, and by Rachel two sons. Taking the Gospel-Age view of matters, and *not* the view presented in Gen. 49, we find that a history of the start of all the movements out of which clericalists later made sects, except in the case of antitypical Joseph and Benjamin, is given us in the begetting of Jacob's children. Jacob's begetting his children represents the true servants beginning certain good movements throughout the Gospel Age; while the birth of his children, except in the cases of Joseph and Benjamin, represent sectarian people and systems developing out of the good movements begun by the

Faithful. We herewith give a list of the sons of Jacob, type and antitype, in the chronological order of their birth, to clarify both the type and the antitype:

Reuben: Greek Catholics and their Church;
Simeon: Roman Catholics and their Church;
Levi: Lutherans and their Church;
Judah: Calvinists and their Church;
Dan: Baptists and their Church;
Naphtali: Unitario-Universalists and their Church;
Gad: Episcopalians and their Church;
Asher: Methodists and their Church;
Issachar: Christians and their Church;
Zebulun: Adventists and their Church;
Joseph: The Cleansed Sanctuary, the Little Flock;
Benjamin: The Great Company;
Dinah: Societyites and their Church.

(3) So viewed the story of Jacob's relations to his wives, children and to Laban gives us a history of certain aspects of the nominal and the real Church of the Gospel Age.

(4) Though largely related to the foregoing, the viewpoint of the 13 tribes in Numbers 1 and 2 is somewhat different, and that in part because the tribe of Levi is viewed from a totally different standpoint, in part because Ephraim and Manasseh were neither begotten by Jacob nor borne by any of his wives; and in part because Dinah does not at all enter into the picture in Numbers. To understand the setting of things in Numbers we must remember that, according to St. Paul's references to the book in 1 Cor. 10: 1-14 and Heb. 3: 1—4: 3, it gives us a twofold picture; which also is shown (1) in the twofold mention, enumeration and order of the tribes and their captains (Num. (a) 1: 2-46; (b) 2: 3-34); (2) in the twofold severance of the Levites from the Israelites (Num. (a) 1: 47-53; (b) 3: 6-13); and (3) in the twofold mention of the services of the three groups of Levites (Num. (1) 3: 25, 26, 31, 36, 37; (2) 4: 4-15, 24-28, 31-33) .

(5) According to the second of St. Paul's references

the book applies to the entire Gospel Age, and according to the first to the ends of the Ages, more particularly to the end of the Gospel Age. Viewed from the formed standpoint, the numbering of the twelve tribes in chapters one and two types the *description* of the various denominations up to and including the Adventist Church; while statements as to the sons of Levi type the tentatively Justified (Levites) and the Consecrated (Priests). We say that the Levites here type the tentatively justified during the Age as a whole, because there was then no Great Company as such, though there were then individuals (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20) who will in the resurrection be placed in the Great Company. It is only for the time after 1829 that the types lay *marked stress* upon individuals of the Great Company as present (as seen in the case of the Foolish Virgins and of Elisha), though not as yet manifested in Class respects—a thing that began only in the Fall of 1916. Hence, to give us the second antitypical feature, the picture is in places doubled; and in the second typical feature the 12 tribes represent those people of the 12 denominations who do not consecrate, but who hold measurably to the Ransom and to Righteousness, and who form the transitional camp, *i.e.,* the Camp bridging the period between the Gospel and the Millennial Age; while the sons of Levi represent the Little Flock and the Great Company (Mal. 3: 2-4). Unless this twofold picture is kept in mind one will be at sea without rudder and compass amid storms and billows, in seeking the haven of Truth as to the types of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness. Our Society brethren are erring so greatly on the Tabernacle, tentative justification, etc.—as the June 1, 1920, Tower shows—because they overlook this twofold picture, and see only one picture—the finished one at the end of the Age.

(6) We note that in Num. 1 and 2 the order of the tribes is not given as the same as that order in which

the birth of Jacob's children is given. The difference seems to be due to the following reasons: The time order of the birth of the denominations and of the Little Flock and the Great Company movements, as such, is typed in the order of the birth of Jacob's sons; while the order of use, character, importance or relation seems to be given by the order in which mention is made of the twelve tribes in Num. 1 and 2. Moreover, the Congregational and the Fanatical sects enter into the picture of Num. 1 and 2, while they are lacking in Gen. 29, 30 and 35—the Congregational Church (unlike in P '20, 41, par. 4) being included in the Calvinistic Church, and the Fanatical sects as associated with all denominations. On the one hand, the Little Flock and the Great Company are typed in the latter passages by Joseph and Benjamin; and on the other hand by Levi, in the second picture of Num. 1 and 2. Except in the cases of the group of three tribes to the East, and the group of the three tribes to the South being mentioned in reverse order, there is no difference in the order of their presentation in the two chapters. We give what seems to us to be the order of the antitype of the second chapter. (1) Judah—Presbyterians, (2) Issachar—Christians, (3) Zebulun—Adventists. These, encamped to the East of the antitypical Tabernacle, defend, as their central view of God's Plan, the idea of Power, the first attribute of God clearly to manifest itself. (4) Reuben—Greek Catholics, (5) Simeon—Roman Catholics, (6) Gad—Episcopalians. These, encamped to the South of the antitypical Tabernacle, defend, as their central views of God's Plan, the idea of Wisdom, the second Divine attribute to manifest itself. (7) Ephraim—Lutherans, (8) Manasseh—Congregationalists, (9) Benjamin—the Fanatical sects. These, encamped to the West of the antitypical Tabernacle, defend, as their central view of God's Plan, the idea of Justice, the third attribute of God to manifest itself. (10) Dan—Baptists, (11) Asher—Methodists,

(12) Naphtali—Unitario-Universalists. These, encamped to the North of the antitypical Tabernacle, defend, as their central view of God's Plan, the idea of Love, the fourth and last attribute of God to manifest itself. These four attributes—Power, Wisdom, Justice and Love—and affinity in certain doctrinal, organizational and practical teachings seem to antitype the four standards of the four camps of the twelve tribes. Under the term, Fanatical sects, we group, among others, the following sects: The Quakers, Holy Rollers, Mormons, Faith Curists, etc. In other words, this group embraces those that are impelled by *feeling* rather than by the Word of God. It is because of this their peculiar characteristic that Jacob, the type of the real servants of the Truth, is not represented as begetting a type of these, under the picture of Benjamin in the Genesis record, though the Benjamites seem to represent them in Numbers. They have been developed by a spirit of error rather than by the Spirit of Truth; therefore do not have antitypical Jacob as their father.

(7) We may understand the captains of these tribes (Num. 1: 5-18) in each case to represent the leaders (not one, but a number) in each one of these various denominations. These leaders certainly have assisted Jesus and the Church (Moses and Aaron) to describe, limit, define, etc. (number, "tell [number] the towers thereof," Ps. 48: 12, *i.e.,* describe the strongest truths, towers, of the Church), the various sects of which they have been the leaders. These leaders are not the reformers, like Luther, Zwingli, Hubmaier, etc., who started the movements; for, the latter are of antitypical Jacob; but the former are the ones who formed *sects* out of these movements.

(8) From the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture the twelve tribes type all professed Christians; while the tribe of Levi, containing Levites and Priests, picture the tentatively justified and the Consecrated. This becomes very apparent, as our dear Pastor taught: (1)

from St. Paul's application of the facts of the book of Numbers (Heb. 3: 1—4: 3) to the professed Christian Church throughout the Gospel Age; (2) from the fact that there were no Levites in the sense of the Great Company during the Gospel Age, until well into the Time of the End; (3) from the fact that until 1916 all new creatures were treated by God as Priests, and (4) hence the antitypical Levites before the end of the Age were the tentatively justified believers; for apart from the Priests these alone thus performed the service of the Sanctuary. Therefore what is said of the Levites in the early chapters of Numbers has a double application: (1) to the tentatively justified throughout the Age, and (2) to the Great Company in the end of the Age. From these two standpoints only are we able, on the one hand, to harmonize St. Paul's statements in 1 Cor. 10: 1-14 with those of Heb. 3: 1—4: 2, and, on the other hand, the typical facts of the book of Numbers on the Levites with the history of the Gospel Church real and nominal: (1) during the Age and (2) in the end of the Age. Hence that Servant was right in Tabernacle Shadows, etc., in teaching that the Levites represent justified believers as distinct from consecrated believers; and in teaching in Towers from 1907 onward that the Levites type the Great Company; as he was also right in teaching in Vol. VI that for Millennial purposes the Levites type the Ancient Worthies, etc.; for doubtless the setting of the book of Numbers types also Millennial matters. It is only a narrow view that, leaving out of consideration certain Scriptures and facts as well as sound reason, moves some Truth people to deny that the tentatively justified are also pictured forth by the Levites.

(9) By the expression, "after their families by the house of their fathers" (Num. 1: 2, 18, etc.), we understand the various divisions that exist in each denomination, *e.g.,* there are many Methodist sects, like the Methodist Episcopal North, the Methodist Episcopal

South, the Wesleyan Methodists, etc., etc. Our reason for so understanding this expression is that the parallel expression relating to the Levites (Num. 3: 15, 20, etc.) refers to the various divisions in each of the three groups of the Levites, whose Great Company antitypes are now very manifest as divisions among its various groups.

(10) Only those from 20 years upward were numbered in the 12 tribes as qualified for war. This represents that in each denomination of Christendom only those who are mature enough in knowledge and character to defend their own sectarian doctrines and attack opposing ones are reckoned by the Lord as full members of the various denominations. The males in the type do not represent males alone in the antitype, but rather males and females who are mature enough to "war" for their denominations.

(11) Moses', Aaron's, etc., publicly assembling and numbering all the congregation (Num. 1: 18) represents how Christ, the Church and the denominational leaders throughout the Gospel Age describe, etc., the various denominations and their distinct sects in a very public manner throughout Christendom, attracting the attention of all professed Christians, especially the Faithful, and would work conditions in such a way as to cause each one to take his denominational and sectarian stand in his place ("declared their pedigree"). This was first accomplished with the Greek Catholics (antitypical Reuben, Num. 1: 20, 21) early in the Gospel Age, and was then followed in the case of the Roman Catholics (antitypical Simeon, Num. 1: 22, 23). The Episcopalians (antitypical Gad) are next given, not to show a chronological order, but because of being in spirit, *i.e.*, doctrine, organization and practice, related to the Greek and Roman Catholics. So also in the other denominations, typed by the rest of the tribes, not so much the chronological order of their development is given, in the order of the presentation of their

types in the rest of this chapter, as the order of their importance and relations in doctrine, organization and practice that determines the order of the presentations of their types.

(12) It is very manifest why (Num. 1: 47-49) the antitypical Levites, whether we take them to be (1) the tentatively justified, or (2) the Great Company, could not be described (numbered) among the unjustified and unconsecrated sectarians. The reason why, in the true description of such sectarians, the tentatively justified or Great Company are not described is because of their belonging to other classes entirely.

(13) The tribal standards and the sub-tribal ensigns (Num. 2: 1, etc.) type the denominational creeds and sectarian creedlets, a mixture of Truth and error in denominational and sectarian doctrines, constitutions and practices (Ps. 74: 4); and the Israelites pitching beside their standards and ensigns represent the denominational and sectarian warriors rallying about and prepared for symbolic battle for their creeds and creedlets. A standard or ensign may also represent the pure Truth (Is. 62: 10, etc.). The antitypical Levites neither were nor are to fight for denominational creeds and sectarian creedlets; but were and are to be prepared for the service of the true Church and the nominal people. And in each symbolic march, *i.e.,* general experience of progress in knowledge, character and service on the part of the Lord's people, real and nominal, they were and are to assist them to go forward to the end of the experience; and were and are to defend (encamped about the Tabernacle) the true Church. Others attempting to minister in these ways have suffered a symbolic death, a cutting off from among the nominal people of God (Num. 1: 50-53). What a remarkable typical history of parts of God's nominal people in *organized* respects we find in these two chapters!

(14) Above we have studied the Gospel-Age Israelites

as consisting of twelve groups, *i.e.,* denominations. The viewpoint typed by the birth of the first ten sons of Jacob in Gen. 29 and 30, and by the twelve tribes of Num. 1 and 2, is that of ten and twelve groups, or denominations, without indicating any special divisions in each of the groups, or denominations. These two sections of Scriptures type the denominations of Christendom as so many *general* bodies developed as such, apart from detailing the divisions of which they would consist in the finished picture. Hence the thought is that of the beginning and development of these general bodies apart from any later divisional development among them. But in Num. 26, a different viewpoint is presented to our minds. Here the finished picture of the Gospel-Age Israelites is presented to our view. This finished picture shows how in the end of the Age each of these denominations would consist of two or more sects, the Baptist divisions, as will be shown, being excepted in the finished picture, and further how some of these sects would even be further subdivided into sectlets. Hence the pictures are distinguished from one another in that the Gen. 29 and 30 and the Num. 1 and 2 pictures give us the generalities, while the Num. 26 picture gives us the particulars on the sects of the twelve denominations of Christendom. With this distinction in mind, we will find that the antitypes of Num. 26 are not only very clear, but that they demonstrate by their many details that our understanding of Gen. 29 and 30 and of Num. 1 and 2, is correct.

(15) The expression, "after the plague" (v. 1), shows that the antitypical numbering—describing, defining, limiting, etc., of the denominations—of Num. 26 was to occur after the third or the combinationism sifting, which raged from 1891 to 1894. (P '19, 142, 143.) Hence this verse proves that this antitypical numbering belongs to the end of the Age. Moab (from father) seems usually to represent stubborn, *leading sifters* (Deut. 23: 3; Gen. 19: 30-38. Ammon types

clericalists). The plains of Moab (v. 3) seem to represent the abiding places where the stubborn sifters would be active, which certainly has been true in sectarian circles in and out of the Truth. The Jordan here represents the peoples of Christendom, and Jericho represents the nominal church. The antitype of v. 3 would seem to be that Jesus as God's Executive (Moses) and the Christ class (Eleazar) as the World's High Priest, in close proximity to the peoples of Christendom (Jordan) and to the nominal church (Jericho) while active as to the abiding places (plains) of stubborn sifters (Moab), would describe, limit, define, etc., the various denominations and their subdivisions at the end of the Age. As we have already seen, Reuben (son, look, or speculate!) represents the Greek Catholic Church, a very speculative Church. Of Reuben there were four divisions (vs. 5, 6) typing the four divisions of the Greek or Oriental Catholic Church. Hanoch (teaching) represents the Nestorian section of the Greek Church; Pallu (wonderful), the section of the Greek Catholic Church under the Patriarch of Constantinople, usually and by emphasis calling itself the Greek Catholic Church; Hezron (blooming), the Syrian or Orthodox section of the Greek Catholic Church; and Carmi (vineyard-man), the Coptic section of the Greek Catholic Church. It will be noted (v. 7) that at the second numbering there were 43,730 men of war in Reuben; whereas in the first enumeration there were 46,500 (Num. 1: 21) . This would type the fact that at the end of the Age there would be proportionately a smaller number of Greek Catholics able to defend their peculiar views than in their undivided condition at an earlier period of that Church. Eliab (my God is Father), the son of Pallu (v. 8), seems to type the Slavic section of that part of the Greek Catholic Church that by emphasis calls itself such. His three sons, Nemuel (day of God), Dathan (Spring) and Abiram (my Father is high, or great, v. 9),

at the second enumeration—but not always, *e.g.*, at the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Num. 16; P '19, 144)—seem to type, respectively, the Russian, Romanian and Bulgarian sections of the Slavic Greek Catholic Church. It will be noticed that the Jugo-Slavic Church is here omitted. This is due to the fact that there was a union made between the Roman Catholic Church and Serbia in the Spring of 1914, which occasioned the murder of the Austrian Archduke, and which thus became the direct occasion of the World War. The outbreak of the War was thus preceded by the full union of Rome and Serbia. Thus the latter's course in the premises was sufficient to take her out of the Greek Catholic Communion, where she had hitherto been.

(16) Next are given the numbers and divisions of Simeon (attentive, vs. 12-14). As we have already seen, Simeon represents the Roman Catholic Church. His five sons, Nemuel (day of God), Jamin (right hand), Jachin (established), Zerah (dawn) and Shaul (desired), seem to type the Catholic Church as the state church, respectively, in the following European countries: Poland, Austria, Germany, Jugo-Slavia and Spain. The Roman Catholic Church in France, Italy, etc., is not indicated in this type, because there was during the Parousia and early Epiphany no legal union of church and state in those countries. Well might the Polish Catholic Church be typed by Nemuel and the Jugo-Slavic Catholic Church by Zerah, because it became the state church in Poland during the *day of God*, the Day of Vengeance, and because it became the state church in Jugo-Slavia in the Millennial *Dawn.* The Austrian Catholic Church for centuries has been the right hand (Jamin) of Rome. Rome has been firmly established (Jachin) , in Germany; and certainly the Spanish Catholic Church has been greatly desired and appreciated by Rome. The number of Simeonites at the second census, 22,200 (v. 14), was greatly less

than at the first census, 59,300 (Num. 1: 23), typing the fact, that the Roman Catholic Church has now proportionately many less to defend her as a state church than she had before the present era.

(17) Gad (a troop), the type of the Episcopal Church, is next enumerated (vs. 15-18). Of Gad there were seven groups: Zephon (North) corresponding to the British Episcopal Church; Haggi (festive), to the Canadian Episcopal Church; Shuni (grunt), to the Indian Episcopal Church; Ozni (attentive), to the Australian Episcopal Church; Eri (watchful), to the New Zealand Episcopal Church; Arod (descent), to the South African Episcopal Church; and Areli (heroes), to the American Episcopal Church. The second enumeration (v. 18) showed a smaller number of Gadites (40,500) than the first (45,650, Num. 1: 25), typing that present day Episcopalianism's warriors are proportionately fewer than formerly.

(18) As we have seen, Judah (praised) represents the Calvinistic Church. Er (watchman) and Onan (strong; v. 19) represent the Austrian Calvinists and the French Huguenots, respectively, both of whom were completely overthrown, and that forcibly, by the Catholics. Shelah (a petition; v. 20) seems to represent the German Calvinists, usually called the Reformed, who were always seeking governmental favors; Pharez (breach), the British Calvinists, who certainly caused a great breach against Rome; and Zerah (dawn), the Non-Germanic Continental Calvinists, who introduced a new era religiously and politically wherever they wrought. As Pharez had two sons (v. 21): Hezron (blooming) and Hamul (spared); so the British Calvinists have developed two Calvinistic bodies: the American and the Canadian Calvinistic Churches. Judah at the second enumeration had a larger number of warriors (76,500, v. 22) than at the first enumeration (74,600, Num. 1: 27), typing the fact that the Calvinists or Presbyterians have in

creased proportionately the number of those able to defend its creeds.

(19) Antitypical Issachar (hire) is the Christian or Disciple denomination (v. 23). Of this denomination there are four groups: the Northern liberal group, antitypical Tola (worm); the Northern conservative group, antitypical Pua (month); the Southern liberal group, antitypical Jashub (he returns); and the Southern conservative group, antitypical Shimron (guard). Like Judah, Issachar was more numerous at the second (v. 25) than at the first census (Num. 1: 29), typing the fact that there are now proportionately more warriors among the Christians than there were in former times.

(20) Antitypical Zebulun (dwelling) is the Adventist denomination, which consists of three divisions the Second Adventists, the Seventh Day Adventists and the Church of God Adventists, respectively, antitypical (v. 26) of Sered (fear), Elon (oak, strong) and Jahleel (he hopes in God). Zebulun was (v. 27) also more numerous in the second than in the first census, typing the fact that the Adventists have increased proportionately the number of their warriors.

(21) The Congregational Church is antitypical Manasseh (forgotten). Machir (trader, v. 29) represents English Congregationalists before they became separate from other bodies. These were the first Congregationalists. Gilead (rocky) types the English Congregationalists who severed themselves from other bodies, especially from the Presbyterians. From these arose (v. 30) the Welsh Congregationalists, antitypical Jeezer (he helps); the Scotch Congregationalists, antitypical Helek (portion); the Oceanic Congregationalists (v. 31), antitypical Asriel (God binds); the Canadian Congregationalists, antitypical Shechem (shoulder); the Australian Congregationalists (v. 32), antitypical Shemida (he knows my name); and the American Congregationalists, antitypical Hepher (blushing).

Zelophehad (sharp wound) represents Congregationalism as practiced in denominations other than the Congregational denomination, inflicting a sharp wound on them by their divergent views (v. 33). There are five denominations that in part practice the congregational form of Church government: Lutherans, antitypical Mahlah (dancing); Baptists, antitypical Noah (wandering); Christians or Disciples, antitypical Hoglah (partridge); Adventists, antitypical Milcah (queen); and Unitario-Universalists, antitypical Tirzah (delight). Manasseh was also more numerous in the second census (52,700, v. 34) than in the first (32,200, Num. 1: 35), having the same typical significance as in the similar cases above-mentioned.

(22) The Lutheran Church is antitypical Ephraim (doubly fruitful, v. 35); and like its type, consists of three great groups: the German Lutheran Church, antitypical Shuthelah (plantation); the Scandinavian Lutheran Church, antitypical Becher (firstling); and the American Lutheran Church, antitypical Tahan (encampment). Eran (watchful), the son of Shuthelah (v. 36), seems to type the Lutherans of the Baltic provinces, who were developed directly by the Lutherans of Germany, a part of whom they mostly were. Ephraim was at the second census (32,500, v. 37) less numerous than at the first census (40,500, Num. 1: 33), typing the fact that their warriors have been proportionately reduced in number.

(23) The Fanatical sects are antitypical Benjamin (son of the right hand). They consist (v. 38) of the Mormons, antitypical Bela (destruction); the Quakers, antitypical Ashbel (God's thought); the Holiness people, antitypical Ahiram (my brother is high); the Holy Rollers, antitypical Shupham (v. 39, serpent); and the Faith Curists, antitypical Hupham (harbored). The Mormons consist of two bodies: the Brighamites and the Latter Day Saints, respectively antitypical of Ard (descendant from rulers) and Naaman (pleasant).

Benjamin was in the second census (45,600, v. 41) more numerous than in the first census—35,400, Num. 1: 37.

(24) As we have already learned, Dan (judge) types the Baptist denomination; and to type the fact that all of them, of whatever hue they maybe, lay special stress on but one doctrine, the immersion of adult believers, there is but one division of the Danites given—Shuham (grave-man, *i.e.*, he who buries the dead, *i.e.*, in the watery grave). Dan likewise was more numerous in the second census (64,400, v. 43) than in the first census—62,700, Num. 1: 39.

(25) Asher (happy) types the Methodist Church. The Methodists consist of three groups: Calvinistic Methodists, antitypical Jimna (good luck, v. 44); Wesleyan Methodists, antitypical Jesui (level, equal); and Methodist Episcopals, antitypical Beriah (gift). The Methodist Episcopal Church is divided into two groups, the Methodist Episcopal Church North, antitypical Heber (companion) and the Methodist Episcopal Church South, antitypical Malchiel (my king is God). Sarah (princess), the daughter of Asher, seems to type the Sanctificationists or Perfectionists scattered among all groups of Methodists, without forming any distinct group of their own. Asher was also more numerous in the second census (53,400, v. 47) than in the first—41,500, Num. 1: 41.

(26) Naphtali (wrestling, v. 48) represents the Unitarians in the wide sense of that term, not simply those who in the United States are called Unitarians. The four divisions of the Naphtalites represent the four classes of Christian people who believe in the unity of God as against the Trinitarian view of God. These are the modern Arians, antitypical Jahzeel (God distributes); the Socinians, antitypical Guni (protected); the sect that in America calls itself Unitarian, antitypical Jezer (form); and the Universalists, antitypical Shillem (recompense). Naphtali was less numerous (45,400, v. 50)

at the second census than at the first (53,400, Num. 1: 43), typical of the fact that there are proportionately less warriors for the creed of the Unitarians now than there were formerly.

(27) Some might say that our presentations above on the Gospel-Age Israelites are pure speculations. But such forget that the Apostle Paul, in Heb. 3: 7—4: 13, directly teaches that nominal and real Fleshly Israel types the nominal and real Spiritual Israel. And his use of the five siftings, type and antitype, in 1 Cor. 10: 1-14 proves that this is also true of the Harvests. Hence it is not a speculation, but a Scripturally-taught fact that Israel in Numbers types the Gospel-Age people of God, real and nominal. If the Jewish-Age Israel consisted of twelve tribes, if the Millennial-Age Israel will consist of twelve tribes (Matt. 19: 28), and if the Gospel-Age real Israel consists of twelve spiritual tribes, why should not the Gospel-Age nominal Israelites consist of twelve tribes—the twelve denominations of Christendom? Undeniably, as in Fleshly Israel, there were twelve and only twelve non-Levitical tribes, so are there in Spiritual Israel twelve and only twelve denominations, the Gospel-Age Levites and Priests not being a denomination. And the further fact that Num. 26: 1-50 gives us the subdivisions of the twelve tribes, which subdivisions we find to correspond exactly with the subdivisions of the twelve denominations of Christendom, proves that our understanding of this subject is not a speculation, but a Scriptural, reasonable and factual truth, for which truth let us praise the Father of Light as its Giver.

(1) How are typical characters often used? Give and explain four examples of such use. How are Jacob, Leah and Rachel used typically in Gen. 29: 31—30: 25; 35: 16-18? How does the setting of the story prove this? What does Laban type, and Jacob in his relation to Laban? What is typed by Jacob's serving for Rachel and being deceived by receiving Leah; and what is typed by his receiving Rachel afterward? What are the antitypes of Bilhah and Zilpah?

(2) How many children did Jacob have by each of his four wives? What is the Gospel-Age antitype of Jacob's begetting and his wives, except Rachel, bearing their children? What is typed by the begetting and birth of Rachel's children? What are the names of Jacob's 13 children? What did they type?

(3) What does this type, so viewed, antitype?

(4) Compare and contrast the viewpoint of Gen. 29: 31—30: 25 and 35: 16-18, with that of Num. 1 and 2. In what three especial particulars do they differ? What three lines of thought show the twofold picture in Numbers?

(5) What is the difference between the viewpoints of 1 Cor. 10: 1-14 and Heb. 3: 7—4: 11? From the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture, what is typed by the numbering of the twelve tribes and the tribe of Levi in Num. 1 and 2? Why do the Levites from this standpoint not type the Great Company? When, according to the types and prophecies, did individuals of the Great Company begin emphatically to come to the fore? When did they as a class begin to come to the fore? What do these types picture for the transitional period? Why must these two pictures be kept in mind?

(6) What difference is indicated in the order of mentioning Jacob's descendants in Genesis and in Numbers? Why is this difference made? What other difference is found in these accounts so far as the antitypes are concerned? What difference in the order of mentioning the tribes is found between Num. 1 and 2? What groups of tribes were encamped respectively East, South, West and North of the Tabernacle? What do these groups respectively type? What thoughts, as central to God's plan in the antitype, did each group respectively defend? What did the standards of these four tribal groups represent? What peoples antitype the Benjamites? What quality characterizes these people? Why is Jacob not represented as begetting their type in Gen. 35?

(7) What do the captains of the twelve tribes represent? What did their antitypes do? What is typed by *numbering?* Who were, and who were not the antitypes of these twelve captains?

(8) From the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture, whom do the twelve tribes and the tribe of Levi represent?

What four things prove these thoughts? What double application should be made of the typical Levites? What does this double application enable us to do? Who taught this double picture? Where especially did he teach each one of these applications? What third application did he also make?

(9) What is represented by the two expressions, "after their families" and "by the house of their fathers"? Why is this so?

(10) What is typed by numbering those of 20 years and upward? What is not, and what is typed by the males alone being numbered?

(11) What is typed by Moses, etc., assembling and numbering the congregation? In what two denominations was this first begun? What proves that the chronology is not adhered to in the typical and antitypical enumeration? Why were the antitypical tribes grouped together as the types indicate?

(12) Why were the Levites, type and antitype, not "numbered" with the other typical and antitypical tribes?

(13) What is typed by the tribal standards and the sub-tribal ensigns? What is typed by the Israelites pitching beside them? What else may a standard or ensign type? For what should not the antitypical Levites fight? What were they to do? What would happen—type and antitype—to an Israelite who tampered with a Levite's work? In what respects is antitypical Israel represented in the types of Num. 1 and 2?

(14) What is the viewpoint of the denominations of Christendom presented typically in Gen. 29 and 30 and in Num. 1 and 2? What is not sought to be pictured in these types? What is the viewpoint in Num. 26? What is the difference in these viewpoints? To what will this distinction help us?

(15) What is the antitypical chronological setting of Num. 26? What do Moab and Ammon type? What are typed by the plains of Moab, the Jordan and Jericho? What is the antitype of Num. 26: 3? What do the Reubenites type? What do Reuben's four sons respectively type? What does Eliab, the son of Pallu, type? What do his three sons type? Why is the Serbian Church omitted from

the picture? What is typed by Reuben's decreased numbers?

(16) What did the tribe of Simeon type? What did his five sons type? What is in harmony with this thought? Why are the French, Italian, etc., Catholic Churches not typed in this picture? What is typed by Simeon's decreased numbers?

(17) What does the tribe of Gad type? How many sons did Gad have and what did they type? What is typed by the decreased number of the Gadites?

(18) What did the tribe of Judah type? What did his five sons type? What did the two sons of Pharez type? What is typed by Judah's increased numbers?

(19) What did the tribe of Issachar type? What did his four sons type? What is typed by Issachar's increased numbers?

(20) What did the tribe of Zebulun type? What did his three sons type? What is typed by Zebulun's increased numbers?

(21) What did the tribe of Manasseh type? What did Machir and Gilead type? What did Gilead's six sons type? What did Zelophehad and his five daughters type? What is typed by Manasseh's increased numbers?

(22) What did the tribe of Ephraim type? What did Ephraim's three sons type? What did his grandson type? What is typed by Ephraims decreased numbers?

(23) What did the tribe of Benjamin type? What did Benjamin's five sons and two of his grandsons type? What is typed by Benjamin's increased numbers?

(24) What is typed by the tribe of Dan? What is typed by the fact that he had but one son? What is typed by Dan's increased numbers?

(25) What is typed by the tribe of Asher? What is typed by Asher's three sons, his daughter and his two grandsons? What is typed by Asher's increased numbers?

(26) What is typed by the tribe of Naphtali? What is typed by Naphtali's four sons? What is typed by Naphtali's decreased numbers?

(27) What six facts prove that the foregoing presentation is not a speculation, but a Scriptural teaching? What should the knowledge of these truths prompt us to do?

CHAPTER II.
GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES.
Num. 3; 4.

GENERALITIES ON THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. GERSHONITES. KOHATHITES. MERARITES. COVERING THE VESSELS AND FURNITURE. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

WE GAVE above a brief analysis, type and antitype, of Num. 1, 2, 26. We found that the chapters give a typical history of the organization of the nominal church in its twelve general denominational divisions, as chapter one also gives a little on the Gospel-Age Levites-the tentatively justified believers. These chapters will likewise have Epiphany and Millennial antitypes. The act of *numbering* the people in their tribes seems to type the act of describing and limiting the denominations as such. That the symbolic meaning of numbering is describing and limiting seems to be manifest from Ps. 48: 12: "Walk about Zion; *tell* (literally, number, *i.e.*, describe and limit) the towers [the main and strongest truths] thereof." So viewed, the first ten chapters of Numbers give us a typical history of the main organizational work of God's people, nominal and real, during the Gospel Age, as well as during the Parousia, Epiphany and the Millennium.

We now desire to study, type and antitype, Num. 3: 1-51, in so far as it applies to the *Gospel-Age picture,* which is the viewpoint of Heb. 3: 1—4: 3. The Parousia picture (1 Cor. 10: 1-14), and especially the Epiphany picture (Mal. 3: 2, 3), differ from the Gospel-Age picture. In the Gospel-Age picture all of the new creatures were Priests. During the Parousia, which was the transitional period between the Gospel Age and the Epiphany, the more rebellious new creatures (viewed from God's, but not from our standpoint) began to become antitypical Levites, as can be

seen from the antitype of Korah and his 250 Levite companions (P '19, 144, col. 2, par. 1); but God continued in spite of His knowledge of their real Great Company character to treat the more tractable of them throughout the Parousia as Priests, while during the Epiphany the Great Company become from our standpoint manifested as antitypical Levites. On the other hand, the tentatively justified throughout the Gospel Age until the Epiphany are the antitypical Levites. They are *"the* Gentiles"—the special class among the *unconsecrated,* uncircumcised—symbolic Gentiles—who during the Gospel Age have the antitypical Court as their place of standing before the Lord (Rev. 11: 2). For the sake of clearness in presenting our subject we will in this chapter limit our study to the Gospel-Age picture, leaving the other pictures for later study.

(3) Usually in the book of Numbers when Moses and Aaron are referred to as acting together Moses types our Lord and Aaron the Little Flock (Num. 12: 1-15; see Berean Comments). This is the viewpoint of Num. 3: 1. In some connections Moses types sometimes the Law, sometimes Jesus; Aaron, sometimes Jesus and sometimes Jesus and the Church; and Aaron's sons, the Church. When, apart from the mention of Moses, in Leviticus and Numbers Aaron and his sons, *without the latter's names being mentioned,* are referred to together, usually Aaron types Jesus and his sons the Church. But if the sons *are mentioned by name,* then usually Aaron types the entire Christ, Head and Body, Nadab (willful) types the Parousia Second Death class, Abihu (he is my Father) types Epiphany Second Deathers as leaders of the Great Company (T. 119, note), and Eleazar (mighty helper, or God is helper), when the type refers to the Harvest of the Jewish Age, represents in general the Twelve Apostles (into whose charge the Truth and the entire Church were committed by our Lord, Num. 4: 16; Matt. 16: 19; 18: 18; Rev. 12: 1), and especially the

Apostle Paul (Num. 19: 3-7; T. 110), though not exclusively so; for the other Apostles also pointed out to the Church the faithfulness of the Ancient Worthies. For the Harvest of the Gospel Age Eleazar types our Pastor, who was given the charge of the Church and the Truth as "that Servant" (Num. 4: 16; 16: 36-40; Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 43-46; 1 Cor. 10: 5-10). For the Gospel Age Ithamar (field of palms) types those leading "secondarily prophets," stars, who successively acted as the special teachers and leaders, more particularly directing the work of the tentatively justified, and for the Epiphany, its messenger (Ex. 38: 21; Num. 4: 28, 33; 7: 8). The special service of the Twelve Apostles, "that Servant," and the other secondarily prophets who have been star-members is typed by the expression, "Eleazar and Ithamar ministered in the priests' office in the sight (prominently) of Aaron (Jesus and the Church) their father" (Num. 3: 4). The fact that Nadab and Abihu were childless types the fact that none belonging to the Second Death class will be readmitted into the Little Flock (Heb. 10: 26-31; 12: 16, 17). Thus briefly as the Gospel-Age picture does Num. 3: 1-4 give us a typical statement of the works of Jesus as Administrator (Moses), Jesus and the Church as Priests (Aaron), the Second Deathers (Nadab), the Great Company (Abihu), the Twelve Apostles and "that Servant" (Eleazar), and the other star-members as secondarily prophets (Ithamar).

(4) In Num. 3: 5-10 Moses types our Lord as Jehovah's Vicegerent—not as the Church's High Priest—administrating Jehovah's arrangements. Aaron in this section usually types Jesus as the Church's High Priest, and his sons type the Church as Under-priests. Hence in this section Jehovah addresses Moses as His administrator. This section types the apportioning of the service of the antitypical Priests and Levites. V. 6, from the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture, shows

how the Lord Jesus, as Jehovah's Administrator, brought the tentatively justified (the tribe of Levi) forward for their official work by working in them repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus—making them antitypical Levites. As such they were set before the Head and Body (Aaron) as servants to further them in their priestly work. Such setting them before antitypical Aaron implied that they were given the necessary teaching and character-development to qualify them for such service. V. 7 shows that their service would help both the antitypical Priesthood and the entire nominal people of God (the whole congregation), when the latter would engage in any service pertaining to God (before the tabernacle of the congregation). The expression, "to do the service of the tabernacle," implies that the tentatively justified were to do the servant work, but not the sacrificial work in connection with the antitypical Tabernacle. In v. 8 the Levites were charged to keep every one of the tabernacle's articles, incorrectly in this verse translated furniture; for this chapter, vs. 25, 26, 31, 36, 37, shows that they had a service toward every article belonging to, and toward every part of, the tabernacle. This types that the tentatively justified were to give some service connected with all the teachings, practices, history and works of the true Church, and thus render some service to the Priests and the nominal people of God. V. 9 shows that they are separated from the world of professed Christians solely ("wholly given") for the sake of serving the Priesthood in the interest of the people. Therefore, if any tentatively justified person ceased to minister in this way, his tentative justification lapsed; for only those wholly given to Jesus and the Church could be antitypes of those "wholly given" to Aaron and his sons. Jesus, as God's Administrator, appointed (v. 9) to Himself as Chief Priest and to His members as the Under-priesthood the sacrificial work that each member of the Priesthood is to

perform according to God's instruction to Jesus as His Administrator. And any one not of the Priesthood (the stranger), who would presume to do the work of a Priest, would lose his real standing before God. Thus, if a tentatively justified one presumed to do a Priest's work, he would lose his tentative justification, and thus cease being an antitypical Levite, as an antitypical Israelite so presuming would cease to be of God's nominal people.

(5) Vs. 11-13 show the relation of the tribe of Levi to Jehovah. In the full, vitalized sense of the terms used in this section, it antitypically applies to the Little Flock and the Great Company as the antitypical tribe of Levi now, and to the Little Flock, Ancient Worthies, Great Company and Youthful Worthies as the antitypical tribe of Levi in the Millennium. Nevertheless, the Levites here referred to can in a general sense be applied as types of the Gospel-Age Levites—the tentatively justified; for they have been tentatively passed over during the time that Jehovah has been destroying the New Creatures (firstborn of man) and the humanity (firstborn of beasts) of the Second Deathers. Thus both the Little Flock and the justified were by God set aside for His service (v. 13). We are not, however, to understand that in the antitype the Firstborn were put aside, and that the Consecrated and the tentatively justified were taken in their place. Actually, in the antitype the Firstborns and the antitypical tribe of Levi are the same persons. The two classes of persons in the types represent merely two different aspects of the same persons in the antitype. Thus we are the Firstborn from the standpoint that we come into God's family before the world; and we are of the antitypical tribe of Levi from the standpoint that we are set apart to God in connection with the At-one-ment work. God has been pleased to use the above mentioned two sets of typical persons to represent these two aspects of the same persons (v. 12).

(6) Vs. 14-21: In this section, for the Gospel-Age picture, Jehovah commands our Lord to describe and fix the various groups among the tentatively Justified. The term, "house of their *fathers*," refers to the three general groups of the Levites as descendants of Gershon, Kohath and Merari; and the term, "by their families," refers to the subdivisions of these groups. While Levites had to be 30 years old before they could serve (Num. 4: 3, 23, 30), which types that only the properly qualified were to do the official work of the tentatively Justified, yet all the males from a month old and upward were counted, which types that the Lord has described and classified the immature as well as the mature tentatively Justified. Our Lord, throughout the Age, in the pertinent teachings and in the uses and non-uses to which the Justified were put, numbered—described and classified—them as mature or immature for these services (v. 16). As of the typical Levites, so of the antitypical Levites, there have been three general divisions. This holds true also of the Gospel-Age Levites—the tentatively Justified (v. 17). From the fact that the Kohathite Levites received no chariots (organizations) for this work, but bore their burdens on their shoulders (Num. 7: 9), and from the typical service which they performed (v. 31), we infer that the antitypical Kohathites (Kohath, ally) of the Gospel Age were those justified ones who, more or less aided by their fellows, individually, by their researches, writings, and lecturings, served the Priesthood and the nominal people of God with Biblical and Ecclesiastical information. From the fact that the Merarites (Merari, bitterness) had four chariots (organizations) for their assistance in their work (Num. 7: 8), and from the particular parts of the Tabernacle that were their charge (vs. 36, 37), we infer that the antitypical Merarites of the Gospel Age have been those justified ones who, assisted by their fellows, served the Priesthood and God's nominal people in connection with *editing*

and *publishing* organizations, by editing and issuing Bibles and other pertinent religious literature. From the fact that the Gershonites (Gershon, a stranger there) had two chariots (organizations) for their assistance in their work, and from the particular parts of the Tabernacle that were in their charge, we infer that the antitypical Gershonites of the Gospel Age have been those justified ones who, assisted by their fellows, served the Priests and God's nominal people in connection with ministerial organizations, and evangelistic and missionary organizations. These definitions of the three groups of the Gospel-Age Levites will become more manifest as true when we further on in this chapter examine the work of their types and recognize the antitypical significance of the work of these types. Certainly, during the Gospel Age our Lord has caused a description and an apportioning of the above-defined three classes of antitypical Levites to be made, and has assigned certain qualified tentatively justified persons to these services of the antitypical Tabernacle.

(7) In v. 18 there are given the two subdivisions of the Gershonites—Libni (white, or fiee) and Shimei (famous). We understand the antitypical Libnites of the Gospel Age to be those tentatively justified ones who, with their helpers, have been as clerical missionary and evangelistic (1) writers (Jehiel, God lives), and (2) speakers (Zetham, olive) and (3) as lay workers (Joel, Jehovah is God) seeking to convert sinners and heathen, corresponding to the three groups of Libnites (1 Chro. 23: 8). The Shimite Gershonites of the Gospel Age have been those tentatively justified ones who, with their helpers, have sought to give religious instruction as ministers—(1) clerical writers on right living and consecration (Haran, mountaineer), (2) clerical speakers on right living and consecration (Haziel, foreseen by God) and (3) lay workers, elders, etc. (Shelomith, peacefulness), corresponding to the three groups of Shimites (1 Chro. 23: 9). In our definitions

we have spoken of missionaries and evangelists *with their helpers,* and ministers *with their helpers,* etc. Our reason for this is the following: all Levites from a month upward were counted; but only those from thirty to fifty years (Num. 4: 3, 23, 30) were privileged to do official work. The *serving* Levites typed missionaries, evangelists, ministers, lay workers, scholars, authors, lecturers, teachers, editors and publishers; while those justified ones who were not mature enough for these things, but who assisted their mature brethren in their work, are typed by those Levites who were under thirty years of age. Those justified ones who ceased acting as missionaries, evangelists, ministers, lay workers, scholars, authors, lecturers, teachers, editors and publishers are typed by those Levites who were beyond fifty years of age, and who, as a result, ceased doing official Levite work.

(8) In v. 19 the four subdivisions of the Kohathites are given—Amram (high people), Izehar (oil), Hebron (friendship), and Uzziel (power of God). The Amram Levites consisted of the descendants of Moses exclusively, because Amram's only other son was Aaron, whose descendants were the priests (1 Chro. 23: 13-17). Because the priests were taken from the Amramite Kohathites, the latter, as more nearly related to the priests, were the highest of the three Levitical groups, and the Amramites, as next of kin to the priests, were the highest subdivision of the Kohathites; hence the Amramites were the highest subdivision of the Levites. This types the fact that the antitypical Amramites of the Gospel Age would do a service that would be more nearly priestly—yet without being priestly—than that of any other subdivision of the Justified, and that would be more helpful to the Little Flock than that of any other subdivision of the justified.

(9) The Amramites consisted of two families, Gershonites and Eliezerites. What class of justified men

have given the most helpful service to the Priesthood? We answer, those scholars who have furnished direct linguistic Bible Helps—the antitypical Amramites. These—not antitypical of Moses (Ps. 99: 6)—preserved the Bible and served as to its wording. Some of the writers that, as antitypical Levites, we will mention, were undoubtedly new creatures, this being particularly true of those of them who wrote between 1874 and 1914; for they were among the antitypes of the twelve spies. The first division of these, corresponding to the Gershonite descendants of Moses (1 Chro. 23: 14-16); are text critics who have prepared critical recensions of the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek originals of the Scriptures and of their various ancient versions, like Origen in the third century; Erasmus, Stephens and Beza in the sixteenth century; Walton in the seventeenth century; Mills, Bentley, Bengal, Wetstein and Griesbach in the eighteenth century; and Ginsburg, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort in the nineteenth century.

(10) The second group of the antitypical Amramites, corresponding to Moses' descendants through Eliezer (1 Chro. 23: 15—17), consist of a number of subdivisions, all of whom served as to the wording of the Bible: (1) Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek lexicographers of the Old and New Testaments, like Gesenius, Fuerst, Tregelles, Davidson, Davies, Young, Brown, and Strong, who have given us lexicons far the Hebrew and Chaldee of the Old Testament, the last six basing their lexicons on Gesenius, who was undoubtedly the greatest of all Hebrew and Chaldee lexicographers; and like Grimm, Robinson, Thayer, Young and Strong, who have given us Greek lexicons of the New Testament. Brown's revision of Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament, and Thayer's translation and revision of Grimm's Greek Lexicon of the New Testament are undoubtedly the very best Lexicons for English students in existence in their respective

departments. (2) The next group corresponding to other descendants of Moses through Eliezer are Grammarians who have furnished us with Hebrew and Chaldee Grammars for the Old Testament, like Gesenius, Ewald and Green, and Greek Grammars for the New Testament, like Winer, Buttmann, Blass and Thayer. (3) The third group of these scholars corresponding to some others of Moses' descendants through Eliezer are Translators who have given us translations of the Scriptures. There are numerous examples of these. The translations called the Authorized, English Revised and American Revised Versions are well known. Wilson, Young and Rotherham have given us very fine translations. While various translations have certain unique excellencies, Rotherham's last revision, using to decided advantage the best of Dr. Ginsburg's critical readings of the Hebrew text, and using Westcott's and Hort's Greek Recension, which up to that time was generally considered the best of all Greek texts, as the basis of his translation, is probably the most valuable Version of the Bible in English. After this translation we would place Young's Version, the Baptist Version and the American Revised Version. (4) The fourth group of scholars corresponding to some of Moses' descendants through Eliezer are Concordance-makers, like Cruden, Young and Strong, for the English text, and especially Wigram, for the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek text, in the Englishman's Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek Concordance. Hudson's Concordance to the Greek New Testament is an excellent work, but merely cites the references. There have been other worthy men who wrought in this department of Bible Helps.

(11) A little consideration will convince us that the chief antitypical Levite helpers of the Priests have been scholars who have labored on direct Bible helps, both to preserve it and to serve as to its wording as text critics of the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek texts

and of ancient Versions, as lexicographers and grammarians of Scriptural Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek, as translators of the Bible from the original languages and as Concordance-makers. Frequently, our dear Pastor has expressed his gratitude for the help that these scholars gave him above the help of all other scholars; and all of us know by more or less experience how much more help in our priestly work we derived from various scholars of this group of Levites than we have gotten from all other Levites. Both the character of their work and its supreme aid for the Priests prove them to be the highest subdivision of the Levites, those nearest to the Priests—the antitypical Amramites (high people). Such scholars also by their labors—"by the charge of the congregation"—have assisted God's nominal people, especially those of them who have prepared easier Helps for the people along the above-indicated lines.

(12) The word Izehar means oil. Oil is used to type the Spirit of God (Ps. 45: 7; 133: 1, 2), the Word of God (Jas. 5: 14; Zech. 4: 3, 14, see margin), and the spirit of understanding the Word (Matt. 25: 3, 4, 8). The Izeharites would, therefore, seem to type those justified ones who have had much to do with the Bible books and texts, furnishing a limited understanding of these helpful to the Priests and the people. We, therefore, understand them to type for the Gospel Age a group of tentatively justified believers whose scholarly representatives have given the Priests and the people more or less help in elucidating general questions respecting the Bible and its books and texts, by their expository, harmonetical and introductional writings. These scholars are especially of three groups (Ex. 6: 21). The first of these (Zichri, famous) are those justified scholars who as introductionists have furnished us with introductional lectures and works on the Bible in general and on the various books of the Bible, setting forth general facts as to their authorship,

credibility, the time, occasion and purpose of their writing, their divisions and their general contents. Home, Keil and Westcott are among the best known of these writers. Almost all Commentators have done work in this department. The second group of the antitypical Izeharites consists of those justified scholars (Nepheg, sprout, Ex. 6: 21), who as exegetes have lectured and written Commentaries on various Scriptural books helpful to the Priests and the people. A host of scholars have worked in this department: Grotius, Clark, Peloubet, Barnes and Bengal have been most helpful to the Priests and the nominal people of God, though, except Grotius and Bengal, they are not counted amongst the princes of exegetes. A third group of antitypical Izeharites consists of justified scholars (Ex. 6: 21, 24, Korah, baldness) who have furnished us with lectures and works on Biblical harmonics. To this group belong those justified scholars who, like Bengal, Newcombe and Robinson, have prepared (1) harmonies (Assir, captive, collected) of the four Gospels, and of the books of Samuel, of Kings and of Chronicles, usually giving the various accounts of the same events in parallel columns; (2) those scholars who, like Johns and Canne, have prepared (Elkanah, God provides [like thoughts]) collections of parallel passages; and (3) those scholars who, like West, Hitchcock and Nave, have given us topical compilations of Bible matters, like topical indices and topically arranged passages (Abiasaph, my father gathers).

(13) The Hebronites, the third subdivision of the Kohathite Levites, consisted of four families (1 Chro. 23: 19). Hebron means friendship, and the Hebronites represent for the Gospel Age a set of justified scholars who have been more friendly toward the Priests and toward their Levitical brethren of all groups than any other set of antitypical Levites. They are such as have dealt with religious history, biography, chronology, archaeology and geography, and have consisted of four

groups. The first group consists of religious historians and biographers (Jekameam, he sets forth the people). The leading Biblical historians are Kurtz, Milman, and Edersheim; and the leading Biblical biographers are Edersheim, Neander, Andrews, Conybeare and Howson. The leading Church historians are Mosheim, Neander, Hagenbach, Kurtz, Milman and Fisher. The best historians of Church Doctrines are Neander and Hagenbach. Very many able scholars have wrought in these fields. The second group of antitypical Hebronites consist of chronologians (Jahaziel, God foresees). In the field of chronology men like Usher, Priestly, Hales, Jarvis and a number of others have served the Priests and the nominal people of God. The third group of Gospel-Age Hebronites are the archaeologists (Amariah, Jehovah says). In Biblical archaeology, *i.e.*, natural history, domestic habits, occupations, social relations, weights, measures, coins, religious usages, etc., of Bible lands, Lightfoot and Thomson, and in Christian archaeology Smith and Coleman, have done good work for the Priests and the nominal people of God. The fourth group of Gospel-Age Hebronites are Biblical geographers (Jeriah, grounded by Jehovah). In the field of Biblical Geography Reland, Thomson and Hurlbut have given the Priests and God's nominal people helps and maps. Cyclopaedists who have given us Biblical Dictionaries, like Smith, Hackett, Abbott, Kitto, Hastings, etc., with their colaborers, and who have given us Ecclesiastical Encyclopaedias, like McClintock, Strong, Schaff and Herzog, with their colaborers, have wrought in every branch of antitypical Hebronite activity with much profit to the Priests and the nominal people of God.

(14) The fourth and last group of Kohathite Levites, the Uzzielites, consisted of three subdivisions (Ex. 6: 22). Uzziel means power of God, and we believe that the antitypical Uzzielites of the Gospel Age are those justified scholars who have especially labored

in the field of Systematic Theology, giving treatises on conduct, doctrine and evidence of Christianity in a systematic manner. The Uzzielites, Mishael and Elzaphan, carrying away the dead priests (Lev. 10: 4, 5), typing how error-teaching theologians would be used by the Lord Jesus to lead away from the Faithful the Second Deathers, seem to suggest that the Uzzielites type the systematic theologians. This is further indicated by the fact that Elzaphan (Num. 3: 30) was made chief of the Kohathites; and undoubtedly the systematic doctrinal theologians have, among the antitypical Levites, been the most influential of all Biblical scholars. There have been three groups of justified believers who as systematic theologians have corresponded to the three subdivisions of the Uzzielites. The first of these consist of those justified believers who have lectured on, and written systematic works on, conduct (Mishael, who is what God is [in character]?), usually called Ethics. Butler, Edwards and Martinsen are among the most fruitful writers on Christian Ethics. The second group of justified scholars who as systematic theologians have lectured on and written works on systematic theology are the Biblical and creedal dogmaticians (Elzaphan, a mighty one protects). Some of these have furnished the great systems of theology for the various denominations and have elaborated and defended their creeds; others of these have sought to set forth their understandings of Biblical dogmatics apart from the creeds. Each denomination has its own favorite dogmaticians. The following are the greatest dogmaticians of various churches: Aquinas (Catholic), Gerhard (Lutheran), Calvin (Presbyterian), Beveridge (Episcopalian), Gill (Baptist), Watson (Methodist), Barklay (Quaker). These and numerous other dogmaticians have not only set forth and sought to prove their own doctrinal views, but also have defended them from attacks, and have attacked opposing doctrinal views. The third

group of justified scholars who as systematic theologians have lectured and written works on systematic theology are those apologists (Zithri, protection, defense) who have set forth systematically the external and internal evidence of the Christian religion. Some of the leading lecturers and writers of this group are Butler, Watson, Paler, Rawlinson and Blunt.

(15) Thus we have presented the antitypes of the Kohathite Levites in their divisions, subdivisions and sub-subdivisions. We have seen that the antitypical Amramites as preservers of the Bible and as students of the words of the Scriptures have had to do, *linguistically,* with the Bible and its wording; that the antitypical Izeharites, as students of the contents of the Scriptures, have had to do, *interpretationally,* with the books and with the thoughts of the books and verses of the Bible, individually and in their relation to one another; that the antitypical Hebronites as historical students have had to do, *historically,* with Biblical and Ecclesiastical persons, principles and things; and that the antitypical Uzzielites, as thinkers, have had to do, *systematically,* with (imperfectly understood) Biblical theology and with Creedal theology. The antitypical Kohathites of the Gospel Age are the scholarly writers sand teachers of Christianity, writing and lecturing from a more or less scientific standpoint. As we look at the typical Kohathite Levites and their work, and then at their Gospel-Age antitypes, surely we recognize the striking correspondence of the type and antitype. This correspondence will become more strikingly impressive when we come to study the articles of the Tabernacle which the typical Kohathites had as their charge in the service.

(16) The third group of typical Levites were the Merarites, who consisted of two subdivisions—Mahli (sick, weak) and Mushi (withdrawing) (Num. 3: 17, 20, 33). These typify a class of justified ones who do a work that supplies the gap in religious needs not

filled by the work of the other two groups of Levites. The antitypical Kohathites furnish the learned works for the Priests and God's nominal people. The antitypical Gershonites furnish the discourses and printed matter influencing people to repentance, faith and consecration. The Merarites seem to type those editors who prepare these works for publication and those publishers who see to their printing and circulation. The Mahlites (weak) seem to type the justified editors who, as we use the word in this connection, are, not writers and conductors of periodicals and magazines, but preparers of others' writings for the press, *e.g.,* by compiling, arranging, emending, annotating, indexing, etc., the writings of the antitypical Kohathites and Gershonites—editors in the same general sense of the word as those brethren are who prepared the Tower Reprints for the press; they *edited* them, but did not *write* them. Their work is to compile and arrange the articles, to insert notes for various reasons, some of which point out where a clearer presentation of the subject is to be found, to prepare indices for them, etc. But, of course, the editors of the Tower Reprints are not Gospel-Age Mahlites; they are transitional Mahlites. Usually such editors prepare a preface for the work that they are editing, and often also a biography of its author, and add such things as are intended to increase its usefulness, clearness, completeness, etc. These editors have consisted of two classes: (1) editors of Bibles; (2) editors of other religious works, respectively typed by Eleazar (son of Mahli), mighty helper, and Kish, bow (1 Chro. 23: 21). The virtual discontinuance of the separate activity of such Bible editors during the last seventy-five years, and their more or less uniting with the class of general editors of religious books are indicated in 1 Chro. 23: 22.

(17) The Mushite branch of the Merarites types for the Gospel Age those publishers who have devoted themselves to arranging for the copying or printing and circulating of Christian literature. Before printing

was invented these secured scribes who copied such literature. Especially were certain of the monks employed in such copying work; and their orders or patrons saw to the securing of the materials for their work, and to the circulation of the copies which they made, and thus the former acted as publishers. With the invention of printing these conditions very materially changed. Individual, company and corporational publishers sprang up on all sides, and pushed forward the work of arranging for the printing and circulating of literature helpful to the Priests and God's nominal people. According to 1 Chro. 23: 23, such publishers have been of three classes: (1) book publishers (Mahli, weak, sick); (2) tract, periodical and magazine publishers (Eder, flock, referring to the great number of these); and (3) Bible publishers (Jeremoth, heights, referring to the fact that this set of publishers was the highest order of all of the publishers of religious literature).

(18) Having already explained the antitype of Elzaphan, the Kohathite chief, we will now give the antitype of the Gershonite and Merarite chiefs. Eliasaph (a mighty one, or God, gathers) the son of Lael (for God) seems to type the evangelists who, acting for God in gathering many converts, have been the most influential group among the antitypical Gershonites (Num. 3: 24). Zuriel (rock of God, or mighty rock) the son of Abihail (my father is strength) seems to type those publishers who, as publishers of the Bible—the power of God (Heb. 4: 12)—in the living languages, were the most influential group among the antitypical Merarites of the Gospel Age.

(19) If with the name of the tribe, Levi, the names of its three divisions, of their subdivisions, of their sub-subdivisions, etc., as given above are counted, it will be found that they total 40 in all. But according to 1 Chro. 23: 10, 11, 16; 24: 20; 23: 17; 24: 21; 23

18; 24: 22; 23: 20; 24: 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, there were 20 other persons, typing 20 sections coming under some of the subdivisions above mentioned. Hence the various sections of the Gospel-Age Levites consist of 60 in all, antitypical of the 60 persons named as the Levite leaders. There is a very specific reason for these 60 sections among the antitypical Levites, as we will see later on. Briefly would we now give our understanding of these remaining 20. These 20 typical sub-heads of Levite families seem to type some emphasized subsections of some justified groups already referred to. We have already seen that the antitypical Shimites—ministers—consist of three subdivisions (1 Chro. 23: 9): (1) clerical writers on justified living and consecration; (2) clerical speakers on justified living and consecration; and (3) laymen workers, elders, etc. We believe that the four classes typed in 1 Chro. 23: 10, 11 by the four descendants of Shimei are the lay-teachers, a subdivision of antitypical Shelomith (1 Chro. 23: 9) and not its lay-*elders* division. These four would therefore refer to those justified ones who are general or local teachers of Christian life and faith in practically all denominations. Roughly we may group them as follows: (1) Prayer meeting workers (Jahath, united); (2) Bible Class leaders (Zazah, plenty); (3) laymen giving discourses on right living and consecration (Jeush, assembler); and (4) laymen writers on right living and consecration (Beriah, well of Jehovah). Those under (3) and (4) are few and may well be put into one group, because of their small numbers and of their non-clerical general efforts to help people toward consecration (1 Chro. 23: 11).

(20) So, too, we find some specially marked Kohathites, whom we will now briefly consider, type and antitype. Several of these are among the Gershonite Amramites (1 Chro. 23: 16; 24: 20). As we have seen, the Gershonite descendants of Amram (1 Chro. 23: 16) represent the text critics who have furnished

us with critical recensions of the Scriptures in the original languages and in the various ancient Versions. Shebuel (captive of God), as the chief of this branch of the Gershonite Amramites, seems to type the text critics who have given us critical Recensions of the Old Testament Scriptures in the original languages. Jehdeiah (may Jehovah make glad) seems to type those who have given us critical Recensions of the Greek New Testament. As we have seen, the Eliezerite Amramites (1 Chro. 23: 17) type those justified ones who have given us helps on the words and wording of the Scriptures apart from the helps implied in the critical Recensions. The chief helpers in this respect, typed by Rehabiah (Jehovah enlarges), are the writers on Bible words. Isshiah (Jehovah loans), being the chief of Rehabiah's sons, seems to type Concordance makers. Special mention is made of some Izeharites other than those mentioned among the 40 Levite groups above treated (1 Chro. 23: 18, 24: 22). These type certain ones of antitypical Abiasaph, a subdivision under the third group (antitypical Korah) of the antitypical Izeharites, *i.e.*, topical compilers. Those who compiled passages topically we believe are typed by Shelomoth (peacefulness); and those of such compilers are antitypical Jahath (united), who arranged these passages topically as a *summary* of the Scriptures. There are some Uzzielites other than those treated above among the 40 groups of Levites (1 Chro. 23: 20; 24: 24, 25). Of these, on the one hand, Micah (who is like Jehovah?) types that subdivision of the antitypical Elzaphanites—the dogmaticians—who are creedal dogmaticians, *i.e.*, those who set forth the doctrines of the creeds as distinct from the Biblical doctrines; and Shamir (thorn) seems to type the controversial dogmaticians whose arguments are thorns to the opposing creedal dogmaticians; on the other hand, Isshiah (Jehovah loans) seems to type those antitypical Elzaphanites—dogmaticians—who have sought to set forth the Biblical doctrines; and Zachariah

(Jehovah remembers) seems to type those of them who have sought to set forth the New Testament doctrines as distinct from the Old Testament doctrines.

(21) So, too, do we find six Merarites (1 Chro. 24: 26-29) mentioned additional to those treated among the 40 Levitical groups first explained above. The first of these are five descendants of Merari through Mushi, therefore typical of publishers. We are of the opinion that Jaaziah (Jehovah comforts) types the publishers of the antitypical Kohathite works, the scholarly scientific works on the Bible and Christianity. Therefore we would understand Beno (his son, in allusion to the publishers of the works of the chief Kohathite group) to type the publishers of the antitypical Amramite works; Shoham (onyx) seems to type the publishers of the antitypical Izeharite works; Zaccur (mindful—historical and factual writers must especially deal with matters of memory) seems to type the publishers of antitypical Hebronite works; and Ibri (Hebrew, the chief earthly people) seems to type publishers of antitypical Uzzielite works, whose authors as God's servants have been of the greatest repute among God's nominal people. The sixth of these additional Merarites is Jerahmeel (God has mercy) who was a descendant of Mahli through Kish—the type of editors of Christian books—and who seems to type editors of books of the antitypical Libnite Gershonites, which show forth the mercy of God to the unconverted. Thus in 60 sections the Lord has given us a typical view of the main activities of the Gospel-Age Levites.

(22) When we attentively consider the three general functions of the Gospel-Age Levites: (1) Kohathites, as scholarly writers and lecturers, preserving the Bible and furnishing Bible Helps; (2) Gershonites, as sermonizers, teachers and writers furnishing Helps toward the justification and consecration of people; and (3) Merarites, as editors and publishers, furnishing the Priests and God's nominal people with publications

of the Priests' and the antitypical Kohathites' and Gershonites' writings, and in some cases with helpful writings originating among writers of the antitypical non-Levitical tribes, we can readily see that these are the only Helps originating outside of themselves that the Priests and the nominal people of God need for their participation in the Divine service. Of course, there are writings which have originated among the Priests that help them and God's nominal people, as there are writings which have originated in the "Camp" which have helped the Priests and the nominal people of God. But in general their need of scholarly help in the way of scholarly works has been supplied by the antitypical Kohathites; their need of *new* Priests has usually been supplied by the efforts of the antitypical Gershonites, in leading certain ones to justification and consecration; and their need of publications has usually been supplied by the editing, printing and circulating efforts of the antitypical Merarites. What other human helps originating outside of themselves could the Priests need for their sacrificing? None. What other human helps originating outside of themselves and the Priests could the world need for their relations to God? None. Evidently, therefore, the above three groups of justified believers are the antitypes of the three Levitical groups; and the above-described activities of these three groups of justified believers are the antitypes of the activities of the three Levitical groups. Therefore the harmony between the Scriptures and the facts relating to the types and antitypes convinces us that the above presentation is correct. When we study antitypically the other types as given in Num. 3: 21-51, etc., we will find this harmony still further corroborating our presentation. These considerations unanswerably demonstrate the Scripturalness, reasonableness and factualness of tentative justification; for they show us just who are, and what are the activities of, the tentatively justified.

(23) Above we studied briefly the Gospel-Age Levites in their sixty groups. These groups do not mark fixed individuals as such; rather they mark classes of workers according to the character of their work. So far as individuals are concerned one may be for awhile laboring in one group, and then later be laboring in another group. Yet, during the same period he may be laboring in several of these groups. As an example we might cite Dr. Edward Robinson, who is generally considered the greatest American Biblical scholar of the last century. As a Greek and Hebrew lexicographer he worked as an Amramite Kohathite. When he prepared his Harmony of the Gospels and did exegetical work he labored as an Izeharite Kohathite. As a writer of a Biblical Dictionary and as a writer on the Biblical Antiquities and Geography he labored as an Hebronite Kohathite. When he wrote on doctrinal subjects in his magazine, he worked as an Uzzielite Kohathite. As a preacher he was a Libnite or a Shimite Gershonite, accordingly as he preached for unjustified or justified persons; and as the editor and translator of others' theological works he acted as a Mahlite Merarite. Thus the group with which he acted at any particular time depended upon the character of his work at that particular time. Many of the Gospel-Age Levites began their official careers as ministers, which gave them opportunities to do evangelistic work as antitypical Libnites, and pastoral work as antitypical Shimites. Some of these, later, by their studies qualified themselves for Kohathite work, which in due time they did. In fact, this has been the usual course among those Levites who became antitypical Kohathites. Accordingly, we see that the typical Levitical groups did not represent for the Gospel Age fixed individuals in fixed antitypical Levitical divisions and groups; rather they represented classes of workers according to the character of their activities. It remains to be seen whether the Transitional

Levites—the Epiphany Levites—will in the finished picture have the peculiarity that we have just noted in the Gospel-Age Levites. We will have to wait some years before we can from the standpoint of facts reach certainty on this subject, though it would not surprise us, if this should prove to be the case. During the Millennial Age such a transition from one division into another division of the three Levitical divisions will be impossible; for no Ancient Worthy will become a Great Company member or a Youthful Worthy, and vice versa, though it is likely that within each of the three divisions every individual of each division will partake in the work of its various subdivisions, but not in the work of other divisions than his own.

(24) In Num. 3: 21-26 we have a brief description of the Gershonites and their work. The description here is a general one and involves all the Gershonites upward of thirty days of age; while the description of them and their work in Num. 4: 21-28 is a more particular one and involves the serving Gershonites alone. In Num. 3: 22 the number of them from thirty days old and upward is given as 7,500. It will be noticed that from the same standpoint the Kohathites (v. 28) numbered 8,600 and that the Merarites (v. 34) numbered 6,200. We believe this types the following thought: that there would be more antitypical Kohathites in their officiating and supporting members than there would be of the officiating and supporting members of the antitypical Gershonites, but that the latter would be more numerous than the serving and supporting members of the antitypical Merarites. This is apparent because almost without exception the justified support the work of the antitypical officiating Kohathites, while not a few of the justified have withheld support from the antitypical Gershonites. Still smaller numbers support the officiating editors, publishers and printers who constitute the antitypical Merarites. The position assigned the Gershonites on the

west side, in the rear of the tabernacle (v. 23), seems to type the fact that their position and work were from the Divine standpoint the least honorable and useful of the Levitical divisions. This also becomes manifest when we consider the parts of the sanctuary and its articles that each division had as its charge, and when we consider the positions about the tabernacle occupied by the other Levite divisions and by Moses, Aaron and his family. We have already given our thought on v. 24 as teaching that the evangelistic workers—those inciting people to repentance, faith and consecration—have been the most influential group among the antitypical Gershonites and therefore are the antitype of Eliasaph, the son of Lael.

(25) In vs. 25 and 26 the sphere of Gershonite activity is set forth. The description in Num. 4: 25, 26 is somewhat fuller than in the vs. that we are now studying; for Num. 3: 25, 26 omits mentioning both the seal (incorrectly rendered badger) skin covering of the tabernacle and the instruments of the cords for the court's curtain and gate, both of which are mentioned in Num. 4: 25, 26. It was our study of the articles mentioned in these verses and their symbolisms that enabled us to recognize that the Gershonites type for the Gospel Age those justified ones who as missionaries, ministers, evangelists, lay helpers and their supporters assist people to repentance and faith, and who as ministers, evangelists, lay helpers and their supporters assist justified ones to consecration and in some respects give the Priests help in their New Creatures and in their humanity. As we proceed, this, we trust, will become clear. First of all, the Gershonites had charge of the tabernacle, i.e., the linen curtains that were next to the boards. This restricted use of the word tabernacle, which usually, and in its broad sense, refers to the entire structure, types the Church as new creatures, either in the begotten or in the born condition (Heb. 8: 2, 9, 11; Rev. 13: 6; 15: 5; 21: 3).

Accordingly, the antitypical Gershonites have had a charge toward the new creatures. How could they have ministered to these? This will become manifest especially when we remember that throughout the Age until 1846, but more especially until 1878, there had been no outward separation between the Consecrated as a class and the justified, and that many of the former were members of churches in which some of the latter acted as pastors, evangelists and lay helpers. The sermons, teachings, conversations and writings of these have in not a few cases assisted the Priests, especially on questions of proper conduct. And thus they served the antitypical "tabernacle"—new creatures. The Gospel-Age Levites, of course, for obvious reasons, could not serve the Spirit-born new creatures, except indirectly, through advancing Jesus' work until 1878, and from then on His and the glorified Church's work.

(26) The next part of the Gershonites' service was the tent—the curtains of goats' hair that covered the "tabernacle"—the linen curtains. The use of the goats' hair curtains—which are here called the tent—*ohel*—the word usually translated tabernacle-as a tent to cover the linen curtains, readily suggests the thought of our humanity, which is expressly called a tabernacle, as being the tent, or house—the cover—of our New Creatures (2 Cor. 5: 1, 4; 2 Pet. 1: 13, 14). Its being white represents our humanity, justified through the righteousness of Christ (Is. 1: 18; Rom. 4: 6-8). Its doubled part in front of the tabernacle types the doubled feature in justification—tentative and vitalized justification. How have the antitypical Gershonites served the justified humanity of the Priests as typed by the Gershonites' ministry toward the "tent"—the curtains of goats' hair? We answer: By their sermons, teachings, conversations and writings they sometimes threw out suggestions that helped the Priests better to keep their justified humanity and to act in

harmony with righteousness, as well as to cleanse in a measure their earthen vessels; also by some of their teachings explaining and defending justification-the part of this curtain doubled in the fiont of the tabernacle-they helped the Priests. The third part of the tabernacle that was in charge of the typical Gershonites was the cover of the tent made of rams' skins dyed red. This part of the tabernacle, covering that which types our justified humanity, would very fittingly type our Lord's ransom sacrifice as our righteousness, which covers the blemishes of our humanity, making it righteous in God's sight (Is. 61: 10; Rom. 4: 6-8; 3: 21-26; 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Gal. *2:* 16; 3: 22; Phil. 3: 9). The red color—the color of blood—represents the thought that this righteousness could be made available to us only by the shed blood—the death—of the Lord Jesus. Rams' skins were used because Christ's humanity sacrificed unto death is frequently represented by the sacrifice of a ram. In the antitype, how did the Gospel-Age Levites minister to the humanity of the Priests in connection with the righteousness of Christ as its cover? This was done by their sermons, teachings, conversations and writings, which from time to time moved various of the Priests to lay firmer hold on the righteousness of Christ as the cover of their blemishes. If those of us who were Spirit-begotten while yet in the nominal church look back to some of our slips and blemishes of those days, we will doubtless recall how such help was rendered us by some antitypical Gershonites' work which sent us "to the blood again which makes and keeps me whole."

(27) The fourth part of the tabernacle that was in the charge of the Gershonites was the cover of seal skins, which lay over the cover of rams' skins dyed red (Num. 4: 25). This represents our flesh as it appears to the world-repulsive and abhorrent. The Gershonites having this in charge type how ministers, evangelists, missionaries, lay helpers and their supporters

have made excuse for the real or supposed blemishes of the Priests' humanity, and defended them from more or less of opposition to their sacrificial course on the part of inimical persons. The last part of the tabernacle proper in the charge of the Gershonites was the first veil, the door of the tabernacle. This as we have learned types the death of the human will—the surrender of the human will; for if one desired to enter the Spirit-begotten condition he had to lay down in death his human will. In no other way could he become a New Creature. Hence the door of the tabernacle represents the death of the human will. What is typed by the Gershonites having this veil in their charge? We answer, the ministers, evangelists, lay helpers and their supporters encouraging by their sermons, teachings, conversations and writings tentatively justified persons to consecrate, and assisting them on various points until they consecrated. It is very remarkable how clearly some of these have understood the act of consecration—a thing which the natural man can understand. Thus we see that so far as the Faithful themselves—the true Tabernacle of God—are concerned, the Gospel-Age Gershonites have rendered them some service.

(28) Let us now look at the Gershonite activities as they pertain to the court. These are described in v. 26, while Num. 4: 26 adds a particular not found in Num. 3: 26, *i.e.*, the *instruments* of the cords belonging to court hangings and gate. Our dear Pastor has shown us that the linen court hangings type Christ's righteousness, which the Gospel-Age Levites have been privileged to hold up to all in the antitypical Camp and Court, and that it has proven to be a wall of unbelief to those who remain without, in the Camp, and a wall of faith to those who come into the court. This court curtain being in the charge of the Gershonites types the fact that the Gospel-Age Gershonites would be privileged to serve by their sermons, conversations,

teachings and writings the justified and Unjustified with respect to sin, righteousness, the fall, the curse, the ransom, repentance, faith, justification, and right living. The second article of the court that was in the Gershonites' care was the gate of the court. This represents our Lord Jesus as the Door through whom alone one enters into justification (John 10: 7; 14: 6; 1 Cor. 1: 30). Their having a charge respecting the gate of the court types the fact that it is the peculiar privilege of the Gospel-Age Gershonites in their Libnite branch—ministers, missionaries, evangelists, lay workers and their supporters—to hold up to the world by their sermons, conversations, teachings and writings the teachings that center in Christ as the Savior of sinners—teachings like those pertaining to the fall, sin, the curse, righteousness, repentance, Christ's righteousness and sacrificial death, faith, and justification by faith. The third thing connected with the court, and spoken of as being in the Gershonites' charge, consisted of the cords of the court's hangings and of the gate (Num. 3: 26; 4: 26). There seems to be no other mention made of these particular cords in the Scriptures. That they are not the cords that held the pillars in place is evident from the fact that these were in the charge of the Merarites (Num. 3: 37; 4: 32). They seem to have been cords that in addition to the hooks on the pillars helped to hold the curtains and the gate of the court in their proper positions on the pillars. These cords, like the hooks, probably passed through eyes at the top, and less probably at the bottom, of the curtains and gate, and then were bound about the posts, probably above the top and below the bottom hooks, thus co-operating with the hooks in holding the curtains and gate in their proper positions. If this is true, they would seem to represent teachings that refer to the Lord Jesus as Savior and to His righteousness, and that the Gospel-Age Gershonites would use for the help of one another and their Merarite and

Kohathite brethren in holding up Christ as the Door of Justification and His righteousness as the covering for human imperfection. By the expression, "their instruments," probably is meant the copper or silver used for the eyes of the hangings and gate through which the cords passed, and the copper or silver used at the ends of the cords. If copper was used, it would suggest the thought of justification, as our dear Pastor explained the copper sockets, etc., in the court. If silver was used, the thought of *verity* would be suggested, as he explained as to the symbolism of the chapiters, hooks and fillets of the pillars. However, it behooves us not to be dogmatic on these cord instruments as they are very indefinitely presented in Scripture, and apparently are referred to only in Num. 4: 26, on which we are commenting.

(29) Certainly as we study the symbolisms of the tabernacle—the linen curtain, its covering of goats' hair cloth, its doubled part in fiont of the tabernacle, the covering of rams' skins dyed red, the covering of seal skins, the first veil, the court hangings and the gate, with their cords and the latter's instruments—it is very manifest that the Gershonites who had these in charge type those justified ones who have sought to win people to repentance toward God, faith in our Lord Jesus and consecration unto the Lord, and who have rendered some help to the Priests in their New Creatures and in their humanity, personally, as well as have measurably defended before the world the Priests' misunderstood course in sacrifice. The symbolism of the parts of the tabernacle and its court in their charge combined with the facts of the Gospel Age demonstrate the correctness of the above presentations on who have been the Gospel-Age Gershonites and what has been their Divinely appointed work.

(30) The chapter which we are explaining—type and antitype—in vs. 27-31 discusses the work of the Kohathites. In the next chapter, vs. 1-20, there are given many details connected with their work and with

the things with which they had to do. Of these greater details we hope to treat when, D.*v.*, we discuss that chapter. We will just now limit our attention to the particulars mentioned in Num. 3: 27-31. Above we explained the Gospel-Age antitypes of the Amramites, Izeharites, Hebronites and Uzzielites; therefore we need not go into detail on v. 27. We explained also, in our comments on v. 22, the antitypes of vs. 28 and 34. We will therefore make no further comments on v. 28. In v. 29, the place of the Kohathites' tents relative to the tabernacle is given as located on its south side. Apparently the south side of the tabernacle was, next to its east side, its most important side; and it was for this reason that the Kohathites, as the most important of the Levites, were privileged to dwell on the south side of the sacred structure, typing that the Gospel-Age Kohathites would be the highest class, as well as do the most responsible and important work of the Gospel-Age Levites. Certainly in the type the Kohathites carried the most sacred articles of the tabernacle, which types the fact that the Gospel-Age Kohathites would do a more important and responsible work than that of any of the other Gospel-Age Levites. We have already explained v. 30 to the effect that Elizaphan, the chief of the Kohathites, types the dogmaticians as the most influential of the Gospel-Age Kohathites.

(31) In v. 31, apart from the laver, of which no mention is made in the present Hebrew text of this verse, the particular articles of the tabernacle that were the charge of the Kohathites are set forth. It is a singular fact that the present Hebrew text of Num. 4: 1-20, where the furniture of the tabernacle is enumerated, also omits mentioning the laver; yet the latter, being a part of the tabernacle furniture, was, of course, in charge of the Kohathites; and therefore very properly no mention is made of its being among the articles carried by the other Levites (Num. 3: 25, 26, 36, 37; 4: 25, 26, 31, 32). The Septuagint, the Samaritan

Pentateuch, and the Samaritan Version, all of which are many centuries older than our oldest MSS. of the present Hebrew text, contain in Num. 4: 14 the statement that the laver was covered first with a purple cloth and then with seal skins, and, the reference occurring where it does, the laver evidently was carried by the Kohathites. We believe that these very ancient texts correctly represent the facts of the case. The first thing which v. 31 says was a charge of the Kohathites was the ark. As we have learned, the chest part of the ark types The Christ as the depository of Jehovah's full arrangement (T 121); and its mercy-seat, cherubim and glory-light type Jehovah—the Head of The Christ (T 123, 124). Hence the Kohathites bearing the ark type for the Gospel Age the fact that the tentatively justified Kohathites would perform services through their lectures and writings for God, and The Christ class in their condition *beyond the veil, i.e.,* in the glorified condition, though not understanding clearly the Lord's mind on these subjects. Let us consider briefly how the four branches of the Gospel-Age Kohathites have rendered some service to the Priests and people in their labors pertaining to the antitypical Ark—God and The Christ beyond the veil. The Gershonite Amramites, who have had to do with the preservation of the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek texts and of the ancient Versions, by doing such work gave the Priests and people the means for gaining a proper understanding of God, in His Person, Attributes, Plan and Works, and of The Christ as Divine, immortal Beings, as an elect Priesthood and as the Law's Fulfiller and Executor; for the passages which treat of these subjects they preserved to us, and thereby helped us, not to understand these subjects, but to have that which gives a right understanding of them. The Eliezerite Amramites, as Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek lexicographers and grammarians assist us by their definitions and grammatical explanations of Biblical words, phrases, clauses and

sentences in our understanding of the words and sentences of the original, relating to God and the glorified Christ; as translators they assist us by various renderings more clearly to see the Biblical thoughts on God and the glorified Christ; and as concordance-makers they assist us in our study of the meaning of Biblical words, sentences and teachings pertaining to God and the glorified Christ. In these ways the antitypical Amramites have assisted the antitypical Priests and people; and in giving these helps with reference to God and the glorified Christ they have borne the Ark.

(32) The antitypical Izeharites have also rendered help to the antitypical Priests and the people by carrying for them the antitypical Ark—ministering with respect to God and the glorified Christ. The introductionists (antitypical Zichrites), who have set forth the Divine origin, genuineness, credibility, and canonicity of the Bible, and the divisions and general contents of its books, have thereby given some help to an understanding of God as the Revealer of His Plan and of the glorified Christ as the Mouthpiece and Executor of God's Plan. The exegetes (antitypical Nephegites), who by their Biblical expositions, have shed some light on some of the texts that treat of God and the glorified Christ, have thereby as bearers of the antitypical Ark helped the antitypical Priests and people; and the Scriptural harmoniticians, by bringing together parallel verses and accounts, and topically arranged passages and indices, in so far as they treat of God and the glorified Christ, have borne the antitypical Ark, and thus have served the antitypical Priests and people, *e.g.,* Nave, in his topical Bible brings together 90 pages of topically arranged texts treating of God, 93 pages of topically arranged verses treating of Jesus Christ, many of which refer to Him in his glorified condition, and nearly 30 pages of topically arranged passages treating of the Church. Furthermore, under other topics he cites many other verses treating of God and

of the glorified Christ. From his topical Bible, therefore, both the antitypical Priests and the people can find much help, though, of course, not infrequently he quotes passages under some topics to which they do not belong, as well as misapplies others. Accordingly, we recognize how the three groups of antitypical Izeharites bear the antitypical Ark.

(33) So, too, have the antitypical Hebronites shared in bearing the antitypical Ark. Those historical lecturers and writers (antitypical Jekameamites) who have given histories of God's activities as shown in the Bible and in Church History and who have described the resurrection history of the Lord Jesus and His work in Church History have borne the antitypical Ark. Those who have treated of these subjects from a chronological standpoint (antitypical Jahazielites) have from that standpoint borne the antitypical Ark. Those who have treated these subjects from the archaeological standpoint (antitypical Amariahites) and from a geographical standpoint (antitypical Jeriahites) have from these standpoints borne the antitypical Ark. As an illustration we might cite Dr. D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation as one which is thoroughly permeated with the idea of God's and Christ's hands shaping the events, etc., of that period; and from this standpoint he co-operated in bearing the antitypical Ark.

(34) The antitypical Uzzielitos have had something to do in bearing the antitypical Ark. Those who as ethical writers (antitypical Mishaelites) have described the holy character of God and of the glorified Lord Jesus and of the glorified Church did their part toward bearing the antitypical Ark. Those who as dogmaticians (antitypical Elizaphanites) wrote on the Person, Attributes, Plan and Works of God, on the Person, Attributes and Works of the glorified Lord Jesus, and on the Attributes and Works of the glorified Church, likewise bore the antitypical Ark. This is true

also of those justified ones (antitypical Zithrites) who lectured and wrote on the evidences of the Bible and its religion, and against the attacks of enemies of the Bible and its religion. Thus as they proved the Existence and Attributes of God and vindicated various features of His Plan, and Works, and as they proved the fact of the resurrection of Christ and defended His works in the history of the Church, they bore the antitypical Ark.

(35) Of course, we do not mean to say that the antitypical Kohathite Levites have seen clearly either the antitypical Ark or the other articles of the antitypical Tabernacle's furniture and their pertinent vessels and instruments which have been theirs to bear; for the next chapter shows (Num. 4: 5—15) that the typical Kohathites carried *under cover* everything that they bore. This types the fact that the Gospel-Age Kohathites serve in connection with the antitypical Tabernacle's furniture and vessels without clearly seeing—understanding—them, yet having some general ideas thereon which are helpful to the antitypical Priests and people. What we have said above on their service of the antitypical Ark shows such to be the fact.

(36) The next article of the tabernacle that v. 31 shows as a charge of the Kohathites is the table of shewbread. This table types The Christ holding up the Bread of Life to the brethren, whereby they are strengthened in every good word and work for their journey (T 115). It therefore represents the Christ class developing one another in Christlikeness. This they do, not by enlightening one another's minds, which is done by them as the antitype of the golden candlestick, but by nourishing, stimulating and poising one another with pertinent parts of the Word—the antitypical Shewbread. The Kohathites' carrying the table represents, for the Gospel Age, the fact that the Kohathites of this Age minister to the Church in its capacity of strengthening the brethren in grace by giving

them some helps conducing to this result. Thus as antitypical Gershonite Amramites those justified ones who have preserved the Scriptures in their originals and ancient versions have served the Church as the antitypical Table in so far as they preserved those parts of the Scriptures that are used by the Church in strengthening the brethren, and thus they bore the antitypical Table. So, too, those Eliezerite Amramites who as lexicographers have defined, and as grammarians have grammatically explained, those terms that apply to the work of the Christ class as strengtheners of the brethren have ministered to The Christ in this respect, and thus have borne the antitypical Table. Those antitypical Eliezerite Amramites who as translators have rendered those parts of the Scriptures that are used by the Christ class as strengtheners of the brethren thereby served, and thus bore, them as the antitypical Table. Likewise those Eliezerite Amramites who as concordance-makers supplied the Christ class as strengtheners of the brethren with pertinent Scripture references served, and thus bore, them as the antitypical Table.

(37) The Gospel-Age Izeharites have also co-operated in bearing the antitypical Table. The Zichrite Izeharites have done such a service to the Church as the strengtheners of the brethren by showing the Divine origin, etc., of the Biblical books that contain thoughts helpful for the strengthening of the brethren. The Nephegite Izeharites have co-operated in such work by giving helpful expository thoughts as sprouts (Nepheg, sprout), of Truth on passages that strengthen the brethren; and the Korahite Izeharites have shared in such carrying of the antitypical Table by gathering together parallel and topically arranged passages and indices that apply to the strengthening of the brethren. The Gospel-Age Hebronites have in many ways helped the Church in its capacity of strengthening the brethren, as can be seen from the

historical, biographical, chronological, archaeological and geographical facts that they have given upon the Bible and Church History, illustrative of and conducive to such strengthening activities; for these frequently have helped the brethren to strengthen one another. The Gospel-Age Uzzielites, more particularly their Mishaelite branch, as lecturers and writers on incentives to character-development have by hints thrown out here and there helped the Church to strengthen the brethren in Christian character. So, too, in a less degree, by throwing out pertinent doctrinal-hints have the Elzaphanite Uzzielites helped the Church as the strengtheners of the brethren in Christlikeness. In some respects the Zithrite Uzzielites have assisted herein; for these assisted the Church to strengthen the faith of the brethren by defending the Truth of the Bible and various of its teachings, and by refuting infidel attacks on the Bible and its religion. In these various ways the Gospel-Age Kohathites have borne the antitypical Table.

(38) The third article of the tabernacle that was a charge of the Kohathites was the lampstand. As we have seen, this types the Christ class as the enlighteners of the brethren (T 115, 116). While the antitypical Table *strengthens* their *hearts* in Christlikeness, with the Truth, the antitypical Lampstand *enlightens* their *minds* with the Truth. The latter represents us as engaging in teaching work, the former in character-developing work. Accordingly, the antitypical Kohathites of the Gospel Age have assisted in various ways the Christ class in their work of enlightening, instructing and teaching the brethren. The Gershonite Amramites have done this while preserving the Scriptures in their originals and ancient versions, by providing the Church with the passages which the latter use to enlighten the brethren. The Eliezerite Amramites, through their lexicographers defining pertinent words, through their grammarians explaining various pertinent

matters grammatically, through their translators giving helpful renderings of pertinent words, etc., and through their concordance-makers collecting verses under pertinent words, have rendered the Christ class very much assistance in enlightening the brethren on the Lord's Word. Thus have the Gospel-Age Amramites borne the antitypical Lampstand. Likewise have the Gospel-Age Izeharites assisted the Christ class as teachers of the brethren, and thus have borne the antitypical Lampstand. The Gospel-Age Zichrite Izeharites in their giving general introductional information on the Bible and its books, the Gospel-Age Nephegite Izeharites by throwing light as exegetes on various passages, and the Gospel-Age Korahite Izeharites by collecting parallel and topically arranged passages and indices, have one and all assisted the Church in its work of enlightening the brethren, and thus have borne the antitypical Lampstand. So, too, have the Gospel-Age Hebronites borne the antitypical Lampstand. How, for example, could we expound the prophecies of the book of Revelation without the help of the Gospel-Age Jekameamite Hebronites, who in their Church Histories and in their Biographies of noted Christians have set forth the facts that are symbolized in that book? All of us know how much help the Church as enlighteners of the brethren have received for pertinent work by the lectures and writings of those Gospel-Age Hebronites who have furnished us with chronological, archaeological and geographical information. Every time we get from a Biblical Dictionary or Religious Encyclopedia some religious information that helps to clear up matters for the brethren we are assisted by Hebronites. In giving the Christ class help in these various ways for the enlightenment of the brethren, these Hebronites carry the antitypical Lampstand. Whenever a Mishaelite Uzzielite gives us information on ethical subjects, whenever an Elzaphanite Uzzielite gives us information on a doctrinal question, and whenever a Zithrite

Uzzielite gives us information on a matter of Christian evidence and apologetics, and whenever we use such information to enlighten the brethren, they bear the Lampstand.

(39) The fourth article of the tabernacle that was a charge of the Kohathites was the golden altar. This altar represents the Christ class, not as human beings, but as New Creatures, comforting, etc., their sacrificing brethren (T 120). As comforters and supporters of one another in sacrifice—the antitypical Golden Altar—they have received assistance from the Gospel-Age Kohathites, and thus these have carried the antitypical Golden Altar. From what we have shown to be the various phases of Gospel-Age Kohathite work we can the more readily see what is implied by their carrying the antitypical Golden Altar. Whatever the help is that the Christ class received for comforting, etc., their sacrificing brethren and for their prayers, if derived from the Scriptures preserved in their originals and in ancient versions, and from the lexicographical, grammatical, translational and concordantial labors of the Gospel-Age Kohathites, that help antitypes the work of the four Amramite groups in their charge as to the golden altar. Whatever the helps are that the Christ class received for their comforting and supporting fellow sacrificers and for prayer, if derived from introductional works on the Bible as a whole and on its separate books, from the exegetical works, and from the parallel and topically arranged passages and indices of the Gospel-Age Kohathites, these helps antitype the work of the three Izeharite groups in their charge of the golden altar. Whatever the help is that the Christ class received for their comforting and supporting fellow sacrificers and for prayer, from the historical, biographical, chronological, archeological and geographical works of the Gospel-Age Kohathites, that help antitypes the work of the four Hebronite groups in their charge respecting the

golden altar. And whatever the helps are that the Christ class received for their comforting and supporting fellow sacrificers and for prayer from the ethical, dogmatical and apologetical works of the Gospel-Age Kohathites, those helps antitype the work of the three groups of the Uzzielites in their charge toward the golden altar.

(40) The fifth article of tabernacle furniture in the charge of the Kohathites was the altar of burnt offering. This altar represents Jesus and the Church in their sacrificed humanity, that on and in which their life-rights are offered as an acceptable sacrifice to God. Whatever service the Gospel-Age Kohathites have rendered as to Jesus and the Church in their sacrificed humanity would be typed by the Kohathites bearing the altar of burnt offering. Thus by preserving the pertinent parts of the Bible in its originals and ancient versions, and by their pertinent lexicographical, grammatical, translational and concordantial works the Gospel-Age Kohathites have ministered as to the sacrificed humanity of the Christ class. Whatever Bible helps of an introductional, exegetical or harmonetical kind Gospel-Age Kohathites have given as to the Christ class in their sacrificed humanity antitype the Izeharites carrying the altar of burnt offering. Whatever historical, biographical, chronological, archaeological and geographical helps on religious matters the Gospel-Age Kohathites gave as to the Christ class in their sacrificed humanity, antitype the Hebronites carrying the altar of burnt offering. And whatever ethical, doctrinal, evidential and apologetical helps on Biblical lines Gospel-Age Kohathites gave as to the Christ class in their sacrificed humanity antitype the Uzzielites having the altar of burnt offering in their official charge.

(41) The last article of furniture in the charge of the Kohathites was the laver. This laver was of two

parts, a base and a bowl (Ex. 30: 18). The laver represents the Bible; the water in it types the cleansing truths of the Bible (Eph. 5: 26; Heb. 10: 22; 1 John 5: 6, 8); the base probably represents the Old Testament and the bowl the New Testament. Certain it is that the Bible consists of these two parts; certain it also is that the Old Testament is the basis of the New Testament; and certain it finally is that the cleansing truths of the Bible for the New Creation are mainly in the New Testament, even as the water of the laver was mainly in the bowl of the laver. It is hardly necessary to show how the Gospel-Age Kohathites have served with respect to the antitypical Laver; for all of their Divinely ordained work has been with reference to the Bible in its preservation, words, wording, books, verses, history, effects, precepts, teaching and truthfulness, which they have presented, among other ways, as the means whereby God offers us the cleansing truths.

(42) It will be noticed that we have said nothing respecting the vessels belonging to the tabernacle furniture and the second veil. These were also a charge of the Kohathites (Num. 3: 31; 4: 5-15). We have omitted a discussion of these, because they are not particularized in Num. 3: 1-51, but are particularized in Num. 4: 5-15. Hence we will leave them for future treatment, the Lord willing.

(43) The section that we have just treated, type and antitype, and the one that we will treat somewhat later have placed between them the remark that Eleazar, the son of Aaron, was the chief [prince] over the chief [princes] of the Levites, and had the oversight of those that had a charge in the sanctuary. This types how throughout the Gospel Age (Matt. 18: 18) the Twelve Apostles by their writings and arrangements in the Church were over the chief Levites—antitypical Kohathites; and for the Epiphany (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-46) it types how that Servant through

his writings and through his arrangements would be over the chief Levites, the Epiphany Kohathites; and that therefore his teachings and arrangements for them are Divinely given, and are obligatory upon them. Hence revolutionism against his teachings and arrangements as that Servant is grossly contrary to God's will, and is a sure proof of the fact that such revolutionists are Epiphany Levites—Great Company members. From this verse, as well as from Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 42-46, we can readily see why the Lord through the Epiphany message has so trenchantly testified against the disregard of that Servant's teachings and arrangements on the part of the Epiphany Levites; for his general teachings and arrangements are thereby shown to be God's teachings and arrangements for these Levites, because God gave them to him to present as His to His people for the Epiphany Levites.

(44) There yet remains for us a study of the Gospel-Age Merarite Levites' activities from the standpoint of the parts of the antitypical Tabernacle that they have borne. We closed the preceding section of this chapter with an exposition of Num. 3: 32, and our present study begins with Num. 3: 33. We pointed out above that the Gospel-Age Mahlite Merarites type editors of Bibles and pertinent books, etc., and that the Gospel-Age Mushite Merarites type the publishers, transcribers and printers of such works (v. 33). We also pointed out above that the number of the Merarites being smaller than those of the other Levite groups types the fact that they would be in their antitypes less numerous than the other two antitypical Levite groups (v. 34). So, too, we pointed out the antitype of Zuriel, the son of Abihail, to be the publishers of Bibles in the living languages. The position of the Merarites on the North side of the Tabernacle types the fact that their antitypes would be inferior in honor of service to the antitypical Kohathites, but superior in honor of service to the antitypical Gershonites (v. 35).

(45) In vs. 36 and 37 there are enumerated the tabernacle's parts which were the special charge of the Merarites. Their significance, understood, will show that our understanding of the Gospel-Age Merarites' work, as consisting of editing, publishing, transcribing and printing the Bible and pertinent books, etc., is correct. The parts of the tabernacle building in the charge of the Merarites were the boards, bars, pillars and sockets (bases, or pedestals, not sockets, is the meaning of the Hebrew word *adonim,* translated sockets in the A. V.). In the tabernacle proper there were 48 boards (Ex. 26: 18-23), 9 sets of bars—counting as a set each of the three rows on each of the three sides of the tabernacle (Ex. 26: 26-28)—and 9 pillars (Ex. 26: 32, 37). These, so counted, total 66, thus: 48+9+9=66. These 66 supports of the tabernacle proper—the linen curtains with their coverings (Num. 3: 25; Ex. 26: 1, 6), the former typical of The Christ as new creatures—type the 66 books of the Bible as *the foundation and support of The Christ.* It will be noted that we count the 9 pillars as typing 9 books of the Bible. This is not out of harmony with our Pastor's thought, who explained the five within the first veil as typing The Christ as embryo new creatures, and the four within the second veil as typing The Christ as born new creatures (T 114, 115). This latter thought is entirely correct, and not contradictory of the former thought; for these nine pillars type *both* sets of thoughts. Let us explain. Evidently the boards, which in the Holy as well as in the Most Holy were set on *silver* pedestals (Ex. 26: 19-25), do not in the Holy type embryo New Creatures in justified human bodies, as the five pillars within the first veil do, because the former were set on pedestals of *silver,* whereas the latter show that they type such New Creatures as are in justified human bodies, by being set on pedestals of *copper* (Ex. 26: 37). Hence the boards do not type New Creatures at all; much less would the

bars type such New Creatures, since they had no pedestals, but were attached to the boards by golden rings (Ex. 26: 29). These considerations prove that there is at least a difference in the symbolic meaning of the boards and the five pillars in the Holy, and this difference consists in these pillars typing something additional to that which the boards type, *i.e.,* embryo New Creatures. But as the boards and the pillars had a similar office—holding up the tabernacle—they from this standpoint type similar things. Therefore we understand the pillars also to type things additional to New Creatures—things like those typed by the boards. Hence we understand the pillars to type two sets of things—New Creatures and certain Biblical books; and because of their twofold antitypes they were constructed somewhat differently from the boards. Since it is the office of the Bible books, as a foundation, to support The Christ as God's real Tabernacle; and since we note that there are 66 books in the Bible, and that there were 66 parts of the typical tabernacle that as a foundation supported the linen curtains and their coverings, which specifically type The Christ as God's real Tabernacle, we infer from the correspondencies of the case that the boards, bars and pillars type the 66 books of the Bible. Thus by the tabernacle structure God has given us positive typical evidence that the canon of the Scriptures excludes from the Bible the Apocryphal books, which the Roman Catholic Church teaches are parts of the Bible.

(46) We note that from one standpoint there were 15 bars, and that from another there were 9. If we count the bars as separate pieces they totaled 15; but if we count them as sets of rows they totaled 9 (Ex. 26: 26-28). For the reasons shortly to be given we believe the Lord uses the bars as rows in typing the number of books that they were designed to type: they type, to our understanding, those purely historical books of the Old Testament that historically hold up

and bind together the Scriptural books in a logical whole, the golden rings typing that they are Divinely empowered to perform such a work. These nine purely historical books, as we understand the matter, are the following: Genesis, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles and 2 Chronicles. These books are unlike the remainder of the Biblical books; for they are entirely historical as distinct from biographical and didactic, and their histories form the background and support to the religion revealed in the Word. Such books as Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther are biographies and not histories, while Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, etc., though containing some history, as distinct from biography, are more or less didactic, containing laws, etc. But the nine books above-mentioned are purely historical, and their histories are of such a character as to afford a background and support for the religion revealed in the Bible, both in connection with its types and its antitypes. It is because of this their peculiar relation to the religion revealed in the Bible that they hold up and bind together historically the Biblical books as a logical whole; and this their peculiar relation to the other Biblical books is fittingly typed by the bars, which held up, bound together and kept in place the boards of the tabernacle.

(47) In a remarkable way the Lord has indicated that six of these nine books would consist of three pairs. From the standpoint of the bars consisting of fifteen pieces there were five bars for each of the three board walls of the tabernacle (Ex. 26: 26, 27); but from the standpoint of each row being a bar there were nine bars, three for each of the three board walls. The middle bar of each side was in one piece, reaching the entire length of its respective side; but the top and bottom bars of each side were of two pieces (Ex. 26: 28, compare with vs. 26, 27). The three middle bars we understand type the three books, Genesis,

Joshua and judges; while, according to our understanding, the three top bar rows represent 1 Samuel, 1 Kings and 1 Chronicles, and the bottom bar rows type 2 Samuel, 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles. One may ask, Why did not the Lord have each of the top and bottom bars made as He did the middle bars, *i.e.*, to consist of but one piece? We reply: (1) Because He purposed by each middle bar to type a supporting book that has no companion book—there is not a 1 Genesis and *a 2 Genesis*, a 1 Joshua and *a 2 Joshua*, a 1 Judges and *a 2 Judges*; and (2) because He designed by the two-pieced top bars and the two-pieced bottom bars to represent the thought that each of them types a supporting book that has a companion book—a 1 Samuel and *a 2 Samuel*, a 1 Kings and *a 2 Kings,* and a 1 Chronicles and *a 2 Chronicles.* Thus the top and bottom bars, by consisting of two pieces, were in each set related to one another in a way in which the middle bar had no relation to them or to any other bar, thereby typing the fact that the books represented by the top and bottom bars were respectively related to one another in a way that they were not related to the books represented by their corresponding middle bars, and in a way in which each of the books, represented by each of the middle bars, was not related to any other books. Thus the books represented by the top and bottom bars of each set are shown to have a relationship to one another by a peculiarity that none of the other books represented by the three middle bars have—the relationship of a pair or of a series of two books. And the fact that there were three sets of the top and bottom bars so related types the fact that there would be three pairs, or sets, of such books. Truly this is a remarkably ingenious way of arranging this set of symbols.

(48) Viewed, not from the standpoint of the nine pillars typing embryo and born new creatures, but from the standpoint of their typing Biblical books, we understand the nine pillars to type nine books—each

one of which was written by a different one of the nine writers of the New Testament. The five pillars in the Holy seem to type five books written by the five less important writers of the New Testament—Sts. Matthew, Mark and Luke, James and Jude. These five books we accordingly understand to be the three Gospels, written by Sts. Matthew, Mark and Luke, and the two Epistles written by Sts. James and Jude. The four pillars in the Most Holy we understand to type the four books written by the Lord Jesus, and Sts. Paul, Peter and John. These four books seem to be the Revelation, written by our Lord, Hebrews, written by St. Paul, and 1 Peter and 1 John, written respectively by Sts. Peter and John. These four are the more important writers of the New Testament. The varied importance of these two sets of New Testament writers is typed by books of the five less important ones being represented in the five pillars in the *Holy*, and books of the four more important ones being represented in the four pillars in the *Most Holy*. Additionally, the subject matter of these first five books, relating as they do to the death of the human will—the antitypical first Veil—logically places them at the entrance to the antitypical Holy; for these books especially treat of consecration, and incite to it those who are in the antitypical Court, as the subject matter of the second four books, relating as they do to the death of the human body—the antitypical second Veil—logically places them at the entrance to the antitypical Most Holy: for these books especially treat of faithfulness in sacrifice unto death, and incite to it those who are in the antitypical Holy. Some mad object, saying that St. John, not Jesus, wrote the Revelation. To this we reply that as an amanuensis whom an author of a book uses to write out what the latter dictates and pictures cannot be called the author of the book in question, so St. John, acting as our Lord's amanuensis, wrote the book of Revelation at our

Lord's dictation and at His furnishing the symbols of which the book largely consists (Rev. 1: 1; 2: 1, 8, 12, 18; 3: 1, 7, 14). It is for this reason that we are right in calling St. Paul the writer of Romans, even thought Tertius acted as his amanuensis in its writing (Rom. 16: 22). Apparently Galatians is the only one of St. Paul's books that he wrote with his own hand, his poor eyesight making it preferable for him to dictate the others to his helpers (Gal. 6: 11). Repeatedly our Pastor in discourse and writing taught that the Lord Jesus was the Writer of the Revelation (H. 33, 2, etc).

(49) All the pillars had golden hooks, to support the veils and fillets, golden chapiters as their crowns, and golden fillets—poles joining pillar to pillar at the top, and attached to the hooks to support the pillars as the bars supported the boards (Ex. 26: 32, 37; 36: 38). The golden hooks holding up the first veil type how the teachings of the five pertinent books *Divinely* hold up to those in the antitypical Court the thought of consecration; while the golden hooks holding up the second veil type how the teachings of the four pertinent books Divinely hold up to those in the antitypical Holy the thought of faithfulness unto death. The chapiters served as crowns to the pillars; and golden crowns symbolize Divine authorization, either as a teacher, priest or king. Divine authorization as teachers is symbolized by the golden crowns on the heads of the 24 elders (Rev. 4: 4). This seems to be the thought represented by the golden chapiters on the tops of the pillars—they tell us typically that the pertinent books, and thus their writers, are Divinely authorized teachers. The golden fillets seem to type the thought that the pertinent books and thus their writers are Divinely upheld in their mission. Most assuredly the Bible, our experiences and the history of the Church agree with this thought.

(50) The Most, Holy was a perfect cube, its height,

length and width each being ten cubits. Each of the boards was a cubit and a half in width. We are told that there were six boards, which equaled nine cubits in width, and parts of two other boards, that formed the west wall of the Most Holy (Ex. 26: 22-25). Therefore there could be only a half cubit of each of the end boards *within* the Most Holy as a part of its west wall. In other words, only one-third of the corner boards showed inside as the wall of the Most Holy. For the same reason, on each of the two side walls of the Most Holy there were 6⅓ boards visible in the Most Holy. In other words, there were 18 entire boards visible from within the Most Holy; and of four other boards ⅓ of them was visible from within; while ⅔ of them were invisible in the Most Holy. These boards are likewise typical. The New Testament consists, as we know, of 27 books, nine of which we have found to be typed by the five pillars in the Holy and the four pillars in the Most Holy, and the remaining 18 of which we believe are typed by the entire 18 boards visible within the Most Holy. How about the four boards whose thirds form part of the four corners of the Most Holy? We believe that they type four of the five most important books of the Old Testament. The five books of Moses—the Pentateuch—are confessedly the most important books of the Old Testament. We have already seen that the first of these—Genesis—is represented by one of the middle bars. Hence we understand that Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy are represented by the four boards whose thirds are visible in the four corners of the Most Holy. This raises the question, Why is but ⅓ of each of the boards representing these books visible from within the Most Holy, while ⅔ of each of them are not there visible? This we believe is to show that while the books which they type do not as such belong among the New Testament books, yet their typical teachings determine the character and scope of

everything in the New Testament. Certainly, whoever understands the typical teachings of these four books knows that they shadow forth the teachings of the New Testament books as no other four books of the Old Testament do—yea, more so than do all the other Old Testament books combined. There remain yet 26 boards that thus far have not been discussed. It will be noted that they constitute the boards entirely within the Holy—13 in each of its side walls. These 26 boards we understand to type the remaining Old Testament books, probably those in the south wall typing the 13 more important, and those in the north wall typing the 13 less important. Surely in the bars, pillars and boards of the tabernacle the Lord has furnished us with a most remarkable set of symbols, and their fitness in symbolizing the 66 books of the Bible becomes apparent when we keep in mind that, as they were the foundation and support of the tabernacle proper—the linen curtains as well as their three coverings—so the 66 books of the Bible are the foundation and support of The Christ—God's real Tabernacle.

(51) There remain of the frame-work of the building proper yet to be considered the sockets—literally pedestals—and the tenons, which, by being inserted into mortise-holes in the sockets, served to hold the boards and pillars upright. All of these pedestals were of silver, except the five which supported the five pillars in the Holy (Ex. 26: 19, 21, 25, 32). These five pedestals were of copper (Ex. 26: 37). The silver pedestals represent the fact that the *Truth* is the basis of the Biblical books, and that these books are *truly* of Divine origin. The fact that the five pillars in the Holy rested on copper pedestals seems to type the thought that the five books which they type are especially useful for those who are just about to step, or who have just stepped from the justified into the Spirit-begotten condition. The two golden tenons (Ex. 26: 17)

that fitted into the two mortise-holes in each pedestal seem, on the one hand, to type the fact that there are two Divine doctrines that firmly fix each book of the Bible in the Truth of God. These two Divine doctrines are Restitution and the High Calling or the Song of Moses and the Song of the Lamb (Rev. 15: 2, 3). Because the Song of Moses is the main subject of the Old Testament, and because the Song of the Lamb is the main subject of the New Testament, the two tenons, on the other hand, seem also to represent these two parts of the Bible. From this standpoint their being in the mortise-holes of the pedestals types the fact that both parts of the Bible are equally and Divinely true, and are embedded in the Truth, and thus they, as the one Divine Revelation, Divinely and firmly hold in the Truth every one of their books. All of the tenons being equally distant from one another in the wall types the fact that these two parts of the Bible are Divinely harmonious with one another.

(52) The above discussion shows that the framework of the tabernacle—the boards, tenons, bars, pillars and pedestals—as a whole represents the Bible as such, and in its parts, the books of the Bible with their main characteristics and purposes. As it was necessary for us to understand the Gospel-Age significance of each part of the tabernacle that the Gershonites and Kohathites bore, in order to understand the work of the Gospel-Age Gershonites and Kohathites, so it is necessary for us to understand the Gospel-Age significance of each part of the tabernacle building that the Merarites bore, in order to understand the work of the Gospel-Age Merarites. Understanding the Gospel-Age significance of the framework of the tabernacle as above, we recognize that it has not been the work of the Gospel-Age Merarites to explain various matters pertaining to the contents of the Bible; for from various standpoints and purposes this has been the work of the Gospel-Age Kohathites and Gershonites. It

follows, then, that they had as to the Bible as their charge all of the Gospel-Age Levitical work which the other Levitical groups did not have as to the Bible as their charge, *i.e.,* the work of editing, publishing, transcribing and printing the Bible. This work, then, is typed by the Merarites' taking down, carrying and putting up the framework of the tabernacle. Very noble and richly blessed indeed has been this work. Their industry and fruitfulness are manifest in the many editions of the Bible that have been prepared, transcribed, printed and circulated. All through the Age they have done this, first by hand and then later by the press. Since 1804, especially through the Bible Societies, there has been a veritable downpour of Bibles, refreshing and blessing the drought-blasted peoples of the earth. We thank God for the Gospel-Age ministry of the Merarites with respect to the Bible; for their labors have very greatly enriched the antitypical Priests, Levites and Israelites.

(53) However, additional to the work of editing, transcribing, printing and publishing Bibles, the Gospel-Age Merarites had the work of editing, transcribing, printing and publishing other literature—especially the writings of the Priests and of their fellow Levitical brethren on Biblical subjects. Yea, sometimes, in harmony with their office work, they have edited, transcribed, printed and published secular writings which have proven, as auxiliaries to religious knowledge, serviceable to the Priests, to their fellow Levites and to the nominal people of God. To understand this we must see the Gospel-Age significance of those parts of the tabernacle, not yet considered, which were in the charge of the Merarites. These are set forth as being the court pillars, sockets (pedestals), pins and cords (Num. 3: 37). Our dear Pastor very properly explains the court pillars as typing justified believers (T 113, 2). It being not yet due, he did not explain why there were 60 pillars in the court (Ex. 27: 10-16).

The light has since come on the question as to why there were 60 pillars in the court. There were 60 pillars in the court because there have been 60 sections of Gospel-Age Levites, as we showed above. Thus these 60 court pillars type for Gospel-Age purposes justified believers in their 60 Gospel-Age activities, just as God also gives us in Exodus, Numbers and 1 Chronicles as their types the 60 heads of Levite families. How marvelous is this piece of symbolism! On these pillars were hooks, fillets—poles—and chapiters, all of silver (Ex. 38: 17). Our Pastor has explained the significance of the hooks (T 114, 2); therefore we will not repeat it here. The silver chapiters being the crowns of the pillars seem to type the thought that the 60 sets of justified believers were *truly* authorized to do their Levitical work and that the *Truth* that God put into their possession authorized them to do their Levitical work. The silver fillets—poles—joining pillar to pillar at their tops and attached to the pillars over the tatter's hooks, keeping the pillars from swaying or falling toward or away from one another, as the cords prevented their falling into or out of the court, seem to type the *Truth* by which the various Levite sections would *truly* support one another. Our Pastor has explained the significance of the copper pedestals of the pillars (T 113, 2); therefore we omit repeating his explanation here. The cords that held the pillars seem to type the helps, especially by discourses and writings, that the Levites have given to one another to support the various Levitical sections in their proper activities. The cords that were pinned to the ground *within* the court seem to type such helps, in so far as they pertain to *religious* matters; and those cords that were pinned to the ground *outside* of the court seem to type such helps in so far as they pertain to *secular* matters, *e.g.,* many of the Gospel-Age Kohathites not only have prepared helps that have assisted the Priests and the people, but they

also have prepared helps that have assisted their fellow Levites of all three groups. Such helps seem to be represented by the cords. Among the helps purely intended for Levites—typed by these cords—we might mention text books on secular and religious subjects that they have prepared to assist young men with collegiate and seminary knowledge for the ministry, such as text books on history, logic, rhetoric, languages, preaching, catechizing, pastoral work and the various branches of theology. The copper pins by which these cords were fastened to the ground seem to type the thought that all of these helps were to be serviceable to justification, and that, as works of tentatively justified persons, these helps had the benefit of their tentatively-justified standing before God. The fact that the pillars, so constructed and supported, held up the linen curtains types the fact that the 60 sections of Gospel-Age Levites have had as their special work the service of holding up the righteousness of Christ—justification by faith.

(54) The Merarites' having charge of the pillars, their pedestals, cords and pins types the fact that by their editing, transcribing, printing and publishing secular and religious literature serviceable to justification to their fellow Levites, to the Priests and to the people, the Gospel-Age Merarites were to further one another and their fellow Levites in the good work of holding up the righteousness of Christ—justification by faith, as well as to put the helpful literary products of the Gospel-Age Kohathite and Gershonite Levites into the hands of the Priests, people and Levites. Those camping on the East side of the Tabernacle type Jesus as Jehovah's Administrator (antitypical Moses) and Jesus and the Church (antitypical Aaron and his sons) as Priests, having in their relation to the antitypical Tabernacle a more important position than had any of the Levitical groups. Any one not of this class who would presume to busybody in their work

would reap summary punishment (Num. 3: 38). *The* exchange of the firstborn for the Levites (Num. 3: 39-51) is not designed to type an exchange of certain persons for others; for the antitypical Firstborns and the antitypical Levites are the same persons. Rather, this bit of history is inserted to show how in Israel the tribe of Levi took the place of the firstborns in religious matters. The giving of the redemption money for the 273 surplus firstborns over and above the number of the Levites from 30 days old and upward is to show that the antitypical Firstborns and the antitypical tribe of Levi are of equal number, *i.e.*, are the same persons. It is well for us to note that the power to be a Levite, with the privilege of exercising Levitical powers, was valued at five pieces of silver—shekels of the sanctuary.

(55) The service of the Gospel-Age Kohathites was described above. Their ministry was connected with carrying the furniture and vessels of the tabernacle, which they bore on their shoulders (Num. 3: 31; 4: 1-20; 7: 9). But before they could bear the furniture and vessels, the priests had to prepare them for the purpose by covering them according to the Lord's Word. The covering of the furniture and the vessels, like the furniture, the vessels, the tabernacle, the priests and the Levites, was typical of better—higher—things. It is our purpose in this chapter to set forth our understanding of the priests' work in covering these articles as typical of these better—higher—things.

(56) The Lord has been pleased to open our eyes of understanding as to the antitypical meaning of the sacred vessels, and it gives us pleasure to set this forth before the brethren. For many years we have known from Is. 52: 11 that the sacred vessels typed Biblical teachings; and for several years we have understood the antitypes of certain of the vessels. We knew in 1910 that the censers represent Bible passages, and we

stated this in print (P '19, 144, par. 5), when explaining the antitypes of the censers of the 250 Levites who with Korah offered incense in competition with Aaron. So, also, for years we have known from the type of John's head being placed on a *charger,* that the tabernacle chargers or plates typed teachings corrective of misconduct. So, too, from the vials or bowls of Rev. 16 we knew that bowls typed truths refutative of error; but it was not until the Spring of 1922 that we gained a viewpoint that enabled us to see what all of the sacred vessels type.

(57) We knew from Is. 52: 11 that the tabernacle vessels type Bible teachings, and while seeking by meditation and prayer, to learn the antitypes of all of the vessels mentioned in Num. 4: 5-20, 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17 came to mind, and gave us the clue. We had previously noted the fact that in connection with certain furniture of the tabernacle, apart from the censers there were four sets of vessels belonging to the brazen altar (Num. 4: 14; Ex. 38: 3), to the golden table (Num. 4: 7) and to the golden lampstand (Num. 4 9); and quite likely with the golden altar (Num. 4: 11, 12) the same number of sets of vessels were had as were used in connection with the brazen altar. For many years we have known from 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17 that the Scriptures are especially intended to teach four lines of thought: (1) "doctrine," (2) "reproof," *i.e.,* refutation of error, (3) "correction," disapproval and setting aside of wrong qualities and conduct, and (4) "instruction in righteousness," inculcation of proper qualities and conduct. In our study of these vessels, compared with this passage, the thought struck our mind: The four sets of vessels connected with the four pieces of tabernacle furniture, typing Biblical teaching, seemingly correspond to the four sets of Biblical teachings brought to our attention in 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17. The reasonableness of this thought inheres in the nature of the case; for if we ask ourselves, What

do the priests, apart from Bible passages, the antitypical censers, use in their sacrificial service, in teaching lines, as antitypes of the typical vessels? we must answer from the facts of the case, that they, in teaching lines, apart from Bible passages, use doctrines, reproofs, corrections and instructions in righteousness. Not only does the correspondence of the facts of the case, but also the fulfilled Scriptures respecting chargers, bowls and censers, show that our thought is evidently a Scriptural one.

(58) Having thus pointed out in general what the tabernacle vessels type, we desire to show what, generally speaking, is the antitype of the priests' covering the vessels and the furniture. The covering of the vessels and furniture was for the purpose of preventing the Levites and the people (Num. 4: 20) from seeing them. As, therefore, the typical covering concealed the typical vessels and furniture from the natural sight of Levites and Israelites; so the antitypical covering must hide the antitypical vessels and furniture from the mental sight of all who are not antitypical Priests. Hence the antitypical covering of the vessels and furniture makes them so that they cannot be understood by antitypical Levites and Israelites. The Priests, therefore, act in such away toward the antitypical furniture and vessels as to make them not understood by the non-priests. How do they do this? By faithfully using, in the spirit of the Lord and in harmony with their consecration, these antitypical vessels, and by faithfully sacrificing with and for those who are typed by the furniture they make the antitypical vessels and furniture seem untrue and unnatural, and hence not understandable, to the natural mind (1 Cor. 2: 1-16). Certainly, our faithfully presenting the Truth as against the errors of the antitypical Levites and Israelites, our using these in ways that run athwart their selfishness and worldliness, and our using these to defend the Divine plan, which they reject, cannot

but make these teachings ununderstood and unnatural mysteries to them. Certainly, our faithfully sacrificing in the interests of God, Christ, the Truth and the brethren will make the selfish and worldly minds of the antitypical Levites and Israelites, who fail to get from us, just because of such sacrificing on our part, the selfish profit that they desire, not understand the antitypical furniture. To God and the priesthood, our course herein appears what it actually is—faithful—typed by the blue cloth; but to the selfish and worldly our course herein is repulsive—typed by seal skins. Thus, because of the natural-mindedness of the antitypical Levites and Israelites, the faithfulness of the priests toward the antitypical vessels and furniture blinds the former to the heavenly things—the antitypical furniture and vessels.

(59) A few illustrations will clarify the Biblical teaching on this subject, which is elaborated by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 2: 1-16: *e.g.,* the faithful consecrated wife, while doing fully her duty to her unconsecrated husband, often follows a course that, impinging against his selfishness and worldliness, makes him think of the Truth and Truth people, and the God and Christ who stand for such a course, as repulsive and beyond understanding. Again, *e.g.,* the faithfulness of our Pastor in correcting imperfect views formerly presented, as he did on the covenants, the difference between Advocate and Mediator, etc., etc., disgusted antitypical Levites and Israelites with him, his supporters and the *kind* of a God and Christ that these truths presented, which blinded them to the pertinent truths and persons. And again, *e.g.,* who of us through our faithfulness in presenting the Truth and faithfully serving God, Christ and the brethren, has not been the occasion of hiding these from the understanding of the unfit? Evidently, the latter are "they that stumble at the Word, being disobedient."

(60) It will be noticed that in each case the vessels

were covered with blue cloth and with seal skins, and in certain cases cloths of other colors were used. In every case the blue typed the faithful course of the antitypical priesthood and how their course appeared as faithful in deed and in truth to God and to the Priests; while the same faithful course, impressing the antitypical Levites and Israelites as repulsive, is represented by the seal skins which, except in the case of the ark, were the outside covering and the only thing visible to the typical Levites and Israelites.

(61) Having thus given some general explanations necessary for the understanding of Num. 4: 5-20 as a whole, we now desire to enter into the particulars of this Scripture. In vs. 5 and 15 mention is made of the camp setting forward; and this raises in our minds the question: What is typed by the Israelites' being encamped and by their marching from one station to another? The antitypical marching becomes clear when we remember that Israel's journey from Egypt to Canaan types the Lord's people leaving the present evil world and progressing to the Kingdom. Israel's marches, therefore, represent progress in grace, knowledge and service, leading onward to the Kingdom. Every trialsome experience of Israel occurred while they were in camp. Hence trials as to the immediately preceding growth in grace, knowledge and service are typed by the pertinent encampments. The breaking of camp would represent the transition from the completed trial to fresh opportunities of growth in grace, knowledge and service, while erecting a new camp would represent the experiences leading up to the trials in line with the immediately preceding growth. As in the type the breaking of camp began (v. 15) with the priests beginning to cover the sacred vessels and furniture, so in the antitype the Priests always start to minister faithfully as to the things along the lines of which progress in grace, knowledge and service is to be made, and it is only after the Priests have made this

beginning on each phase of the antitypical covering, that next in order the antitypical Levites have started to work along those pertinent lines, and later the antitypical Israelites have begun such pertinent activity.

(62) Aaron's and his sons' covering the ark with the second veil types how the faithful sacrifice of the priesthood in its various members unto death has hidden the antitypical Ark—God and the Christ—from the antitypical Levites and Israelites. Such sacrificial deaths being abhorrent to the antitypical Levites and Israelites (Heb. 13: 12, 13) is typed by the covering of seal skins. But that these, while not understanding God and the Christ beyond the veil, will later come to recognize them as fully faithful, is typed by the wholly or perfectly blue cloth being put as the final covering over the ark. The 2 staves (v. 6) that were placed in the ark rings to enable the Levites to bear the ark, seem to type the Old and the New Testaments; for it is by means of these that the antitypical Levites have ministered to the antitypical Priests and Israelites so far as God and the Christ beyond the veil are concerned, *i.e.,* borne the antitypical Ark. The placing of these staves into the rings types the priesthood commending the Old and New Testaments to the antitypical Levites as the means by which they could serve God and the glorified Christ, the antitypical Ark.

(63) The covering of the table, its bread and vessels, is described in vs. 7 and 8. The table types the Church as strengtheners of the brethren with the bread of life. The covering of the table with a blue cloth represents that the faithful ministry extended to the Priests for their growth in grace and service, by the more developed Priests strengthening them with the bread of life, appears to God and the priesthood as it is in deed and truth—faithful, blue. The putting of the pertinent vessels and the shewbread on the blue cloth represents the thought that the ministering Priests faithfully use with the bread of life, the supporting.

and pertinent truths as the means of facilitating their strengthening their brethren. The dishes or chargers represent the corrections; the spoons (which were used especially for the sweet incense, Num. *7: 14,* etc.) represent instructions in righteousness; the bowls represent refutations; and "the cups to pour withall" (mistranslated "the covers to cover withall") represent the doctrines. Cups were used for the drink offerings, which like the meat offerings type our praise and worship, *i.e.,* service, of Jehovah. We worship Him by serving His cause, and praise Him by declaring His plan which manifests His glorious character to others. Hence the cups type the doctrines of the plan, which, of course, show forth God's praises (1 Pet. 2: 9). The scarlet cloth (v. 8) that was cast over these, represents the merit (sacrifice) of our Lord, which must cover the Church (the table) as it feeds the brethren with the strengthening Word, to make their service acceptable; and its use in connection with the table and its appurtenances also suggests that the strengthening brethren teach and emphasize to the priesthood that for their being strengthened in growth unto every good word and work they must have the Lord's merit as theirs to make them acceptable while growing as New Creatures. Their placing the final covering of the seal skins over the table and its vessels and bread represents that the faithfulness of the antitypical Priests in such service makes these things repulsive to the nonpriests. The staves and their placing in the rings has a meaning similar to the same things and act in connection with the ark, except that the table represents the Church as strengtheners of the brethren and not God and Christ in heaven—the antitypical Ark.

(64) Vs. 9 and 10 treat of the covering of the lampstand and its vessels. The lampstand represents the Church as the enlighteners of the brethren, and its vessels represent the teachings that the enlightening brethren use for the enlightenment of their fellow Priests.

These vessels were of four kinds: the lamps, the tongs or snuffers, the snuff dishes and the oil vessels. The lamps type the doctrines, which are the especial things that give enlightenment; the tongs or snuffers, used to trim the wicks, etc., represent the refutations of error (Is. 6: 5-7); the snuff dishes or trays, used as depositories of the wick trimmings, etc., represent the corrections of bad qualities and misconduct; and the oil vessels, used as oil containers, represent the instructions in righteousness, in which the spirit of understanding (oil) is held. The priests' covering the lampstand with blue represents the fact that the faithful service of their antitypes toward the antitypical lampstand appears to God and the Priests as being faithfully done; and their covering its vessels types the fact that their antitypes faithfully use the antitypical vessels—teachings—in enlightening the brethren, and are recognized by God and the priesthood as so doing, while the repulsiveness to the non-priests of the Church and its teachings in their enlightening capacity, when faithfully exercised, is typed by the covering of the lampstand and its vessels with seal skins. The placing of these so covered upon a bar was likewise typical. Since the priesthood receives its main enlightenment from the New Testament, we understand the bar used to carry the covered lampstand and its vessels to type the New Testament. The priests' putting the bar in position for the use of the Levites in carrying the lampstand and its vessels, types the faithful Priests commending the New Testament to the Levites for their use in ministering to the antitypical Priests and Israelites as respects the antitypical lampstand and its vessels.

(65) Vs. 11 and 12 treat of the covering of the golden altar and its vessels. While these verses do not *expressly* mention vessels as connected with the golden altar, v. 12 implies that such vessels were connected with the golden altar, by the expression, "all the instruments

of the ministry wherewith they minister in the sanctuary," *i.e.,* the Holy as distinct from the Court and the Most Holy. Apart from the vessels that belonged to the table and the lampstand, and that were covered with the pertinent furniture, all of the vessels of the Holy belonged to the golden altar. Another consideration is in line with this thought: Lev. 16: 16 by the expression "tabernacle of the congregation" means the Holy, while Lev. 16 everywhere that it uses the expression, Holy, means the Most Holy. The atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation accordingly means atonement for the Holy as distinct from the Court and the Most Holy; but this atonement according to Ex. 30: 10 was for the golden altar. Hence the golden altar, as the most important thing in the Holy, sometimes stands for the Holy, and reversely the term, Holy, sometimes stands for the golden altar. Such we understand to be the case in v. 12 in the use of the term, sanctuary, which word is the translation of the same Hebrew word as is usually translated, *the Holy.* Accordingly, we understand the vessels referred to in v. 12 to mean the vessels of the golden altar. It will also be noted that these verses do not particularize different kinds of vessels as is done in connection with the table, the lampstand and the brazen altar; nevertheless, because the two altars view the same things from different standpoints, the golden altar giving the Divine viewpoint, and the brazen altar giving the human viewpoint, we are warranted in assuming that, apart from the censers, there were four kinds of vessels connected with the golden altar, as there were four kinds of vessels, apart from the censers, connected with the brazen altar (Ex. 38: 3).

(66) The covering of the golden altar with the blue cloth represents the faithful service that the priesthood give the antitypical Golden Altar—the Church in sacrificial respects, and also types that Jehovah and the priesthood regard such service as faithful, while the

covering of it with the seal skins represents that the priesthood's service toward the antitypical Golden Altar is abhorrent—repulsive—to the non-priests. The same thoughts apply to the covering of the vessels belonging to the Golden Altar: the priesthood's faithful presentations of the doctrines, refutations, corrections and instructions pertaining to the antitypical Golden Altar are regarded by God and the priesthood as faithful and by the non-priests as abhorrent, who thus are prevented from understanding them. The staves used to carry the golden altar, as in the case of the staves of the ark, the table and the brazen altar, represent the Old and the New Testaments. Their placing these in the rings represents the antitypical priesthood commending them to the antitypical Levites for their use in serving the sacrificing Church in sacrificial respects, while the bar that was used to carry the vessels of the golden altar seems to represent the Old Testament, which even more than the New Testament is used by the priesthood in connection with the teachings pertaining to the Church in sacrificial respects. This is apparent from the many allusions to the Old Testament that are found as to sacrificial matters in the writings of the Apostles and Secondarily Prophets, *e.g.*, the book of Hebrews and our Pastor's writings. Placing the vessels on the bar represents the antitypical Priests commending the Old Testament to the antitypical Levites for their use in ministering to the Biblical teachings pertinent to the Church in sacrificial respects.

(67) Vs. 13 and 14 treat of the covering of the brazen altar. This altar represents the sacrificed humanity of the Christ class. The ashes of the altar represent the past sacrificial services of the Christ class as memories, histories. The taking of, these out of the altar represents the thought that these deeds are of the past and, apart from the lessons to be derived from them, are to be set aside, and new deeds of sacrificial service are to take their place, *e.g.*, there was a sacrificial service that pertained to the sowing. Such service,

being no longer due to be done, exists now only as a memory of past actual services, and though good lessons are to be derived from its activities, they were set aside as services no longer due when the reaping time came, and reaping service was done in their stead; later among those that have been reaped other forms of service were to be performed, *e.g.,* garnering, etc. The setting aside of a finished service, which now exists only as a memory of a former actual service, is what is typed by the removal of the ashes—they are now no longer acts to be performed, but are only past services as memories or histories.

(68) It will be noticed that a purple cloth was spread over the brazen altar. One may ask why not a blue cloth? We answer that purple is a combination of blue and scarlet, and was designedly used by the Lord to type: in its blueness, the faithfulness of the priesthood, and in its scarlet, the atoning work of the priesthood; while the purple, arising from the mixture of blue and scarlet, typed the thought that this sacrificing priesthood was the prospective royal priesthood. The faithful, sacrificial and royal character of the priesthood's service is, therefore, typed by the purple cloth. God and the priesthood regard their service in connection with the altar and its vessels from this standpoint, while the world regards this sacrificed humanity of the Christ—the antitypical Brazen Altar—and their sacrificial acts for the antitypical Brazen Altar as repulsive, and while their sacrificial service in connection with its pertinent teachings is regarded as repulsive by the non-priests, which facts are typed by the seal skin covering the altar and its vessels.

(69) There were five kinds of vessels used at the brazen altar (v. 14, compared with Ex. 38: 3). We have already shown that the censers type the Bible passages that the priesthood use in sacrificial service. The flesh hooks, used to manipulate the flesh to and on the altar, represent the corrections that the Word gives to

the faults and weaknesses of the flesh. The shovels, used to manipulate the fire and the ashes, represent the instructions in righteousness used in connection with the sacrifice of the Christ's humanity. The pots represent the doctrines that assist in the sacrifice of the Christ's humanity. The basins, translated fire pans in Ex. 38: 3, represent the refutations of error that help the Christ class in sacrificing its humanity. The staves, as in all the other cases, represent the two parts of the Bible, the Old and the New Testaments, that enable the Levites to give certain helps to the antitypical priesthood and Israelites in connection with the sacrifice of the humanity of the Christ class. The placing of the staves into the altar's rings, types the antitypical Priests' commendation of the Old and the New Testaments to the antitypical Levites for their use in ministering as to the sacrificed humanity of the Christ. While the Levites could touch the staves and bars, they were not permitted to touch the furniture and the vessels (v. 15), which, if done, would result in their death. This seems to type the fact that the antitypical Levites should not attempt to do with the antitypes what the antitypical Priests did with them—sacrifice with them; for any attempt to do so would lead to a contamination, a corrupting, a misusing of the antitypes; and any antitypical Levite who would do so, would lose his Leviteship—would antitypically die as a Levite.

(70) It is quite fitting that in connection with the account of the furniture and the vessels, mention should be made of the one in charge of these as well as of the tabernacle and its appurtenances. Eleazar, the elder of Aaron's two surviving sons, was given this charge (v. 16). For the Gospel Age up to its Harvest, Eleazar types the twelve Apostles; and for the Harvest of the Gospel Age, he types that Servant, as we have already shown (P '22, 10, par. 3). How do we know this? From Scriptures, facts and the correspondence of the types and antitypes. Jesus directly shows that to bind

and loose was given to the Apostles (Matt. 18: 18, 19), *i.e.,* to give the obligatory teachings, constitution and practices to the Church and to free them from all other teachings, constitutions and practices. These things the Apostles did, first orally and later in writing, for the Churches of their day. This, through their writing, they have also ever since done, as their general charge of the Church as to teachings, organization and practices. Thus Scriptures and facts prove this with reference to the Apostles. Our Lord's statement with reference to that Servant (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-44) proves that our Pastor as antitypical Eleazar had this work of teaching the truths, organization and practices of the Gospel-Harvest Church, as well as the management of its general work.

(71) When we look at the correspondence of the type and antitype, the same thing is manifest. Eleazar's charge of the oil, for the light, types first the Apostles' and then that Servant's having the charge of the right understanding of the Truth. Therefore all other servants of the Truth were by the Lord's arrangement obligated to submit their understanding of religious teachings to the decision of the former; and any attempt to present such teachings not submitted to the former was an infringement on their office powers. The sweet incense represented the things sacrificed by the priests—their human perfections actual or reckoned—and these were in the charge of the antitypical Eleazar in the sense that their uses in manner, method and spirit, in the Lord's service, was to be according to the directions of the antitypical Eleazar as indicated from the Word. The daily meat offering types the praise and worship of Jehovah through the antitypical Priests' setting forth the Word that reflects credit upon God—praises Him, and through their ministering to the outworking of His Plan. Thus the general direction of the work of presenting the Truth as a means of praising and serving Jehovah, was undoubtedly under the

Apostolic care in their days and during the Gospel-Age—under their direction as they were represented in their writings, while in the Gospel-Age Harvest this general oversight was exercised by our Pastor, as the facts prove.

(72) The anointing oil represents the Holy Spirit in its growth in the graces, etc., fitting the priesthood for the present and future ministry (Ps. 45: 6; 133: 1-3). This antitypical anointing oil was in the charge of the antitypical Eleazar in the sense that they were to explain it clearly, and direct the general work of building up the brethren in the various features of the anointing. This, also, they certainly did. Eleazar's oversight of the tabernacle and its contents and its vessels and their contents, types the fact that the antitypical Eleazar would have the general charge of the Church in all its Spirit-begotten aspects and all its teachings, privileges and possessions. Certainly, the direct Scriptures, the correspondencies of type and antitype, as well as the facts of the case, show that the twelve Apostles and that Servant were the antitypical Eleazar.

(73) Antitypically, vs. 17-20 contain an exhortation by Jehovah to Jesus as God's Executive (Moses) and to the Christ class as the priesthood (Aaron), to encourage the antitypical Kohathites to do their work, and to restrain them from busybodying in the Priests' work, both being done to safeguard the antitypical Kohathites in their proper service. By not properly and faithfully presenting the truths and serving the Church from its various aspects, and by encouraging the antitypical Kohathites to touch or look at (vs. 15, 20) the antitypical furniture or vessels, the antitypical Moses and Aaron would cut off the antitypical Kohathites in their various groups from among the antitypical Levites, and thus prevent their serving the antitypical Priests and Israelites according to the Lord's arrangements; as a faithful and proper "covering" of the antitypical furniture and vessels and encouragement ("appoint")

of the antitypical Kohathites, on the part of antitypical Moses and Aaron, to do their various works would inure to the antitypical Kohathites remaining such ("live and not die") and performing a service helpful to the Antitypical Priests and Israelites (vs. 18, 19). But the antitypical Kohathites should not presume to go beyond their appointed service and *speculate* on the things pertaining to the Holy ("not go in to see," v.20), for this would result in their misrepresenting the spiritual things, which would occasion their death as antitypical Kohathites.

(74) Indeed, the Lord has forbidden not only the non-priests, but even the priests, except His special successive priestly mouthpieces to them throughout the Gospel Age, to do what to the former He calls "to gaze" (Ex. 19: 21-25). The Hebrew word translated "to gaze" in Ex. 19: 21, is the same as that translated "to see" in Num. 4: 20. It means antitypically, to speculate. As the type *indicates an effort* on the part of the people and the priests "to gaze" during the preparation for giving the Law Covenant, so the antitype shows that during the Gospel Age when preparatory acts of giving the New Covenant are performed, there has been much effort made "to gaze"—speculate—on the part of the people and on the part of those Priests whom the Lord has not used as special mouthpieces—Aaron (lights, Ex. 19: 24). Those Priests who have persisted in this "gazing" have lost their priesthood; and some of them are now being manifested as Great Company Levites by presenting their speculations—false revolutionary teachings—before the Church. Yea, some of them have gone so far in this as to lose life altogether—those who speculated until they denied the Ransom, or the Church's share in the Sin-offering, or both. During our Pastor's life there was considerable of such "gazing," against which he frequently gave warnings; but more especially since his death there has been an ever-increasing measure of such gazing. This is manifesting Great Company member after

Great Company member as such, and we fear is manifesting some of the Second Death class. As our Pastor in the Lord's name repeatedly warned against it, so in the Lord's name we exhort the brethren everywhere, "Break not through [the bounds Divinely set to your privileges in an attempt to come] unto the Lord to gaze"; for many have thereby lost the priesthood and not a few additionally have thereby lost life itself; which danger is indicated in the word: "Lest He break forth upon them," and "many of them perish" (Ex. 19: 24, 21).

(75) Our study of Num. 4: 5-20, given above, and our other Epiphany Truth presentations are not such speculations; but are, as the Scriptures cited in connection with them show, the Divinely given light on the subjects now due in the Epiphany for the Epiphany-enlightened saints to enjoy and use. May the Lord bless their reading and study to all of us.

(1) What two chapters of Numbers are analyzed in P '20, 108-110? What two classes are typed in these chapters? How? What other antitypes are implied in these chapters? What does numbering symbolize? Prove it. What does this view of it imply as to the typical teaching of Num. 1-10? What will help to a better understanding of our present study?

(2) What chapter does our present study investigate? From what standpoints? How do the antitypes of this chapter differ in the Gospel-Age Parousia and Epiphany? Who are the Gentiles of Rev. 11: 2?

(3) What are the usual antitypes of Moses and Aaron in Numbers? Cite some examples of this. What are two of the antitypes of Moses and Aaron? What do Aaron's sons type when not mentioned by name? When mentioned by name what do they and Aaron type? Prove this. What is typed by the childlessness of Nadab and Abihu? Briefly summarize the antitypes of Num. 3: 1-4.

(4) What do Moses, Aaron and his sons type in Num. 3: 5-10? What three things does verse 6 type? What do the two charges (v. 7) of the Levites type? What were

the two kinds of tabernacle service and what did they type? What charge (v. 8) was given the Levites? What does this type? What is typed (v. 9) by the Levites' being wholly given to the priests? What does this imply in the antitype? What is typed (v. 10) by Moses' appointing Aaron and his sons to their service? What does the death penalty to the busy-bodying stranger represent? Give illustrations of this.

(5) What three sets of antitypes in their relation to God are pictured in vs. 11-13? What thing that was done in the type (v. 13) is not done in the antitype? Why not? Give an example on this point.

(6) Summarize type and antitype, vs. 14-21. What are meant by the terms "house of their fathers" and "by their families"? What is typed by the Levites' being held back from service until 30 years old, and by their being numbered from 30 days old and upward? How was this done antitypically? Of how many general divisions did the Levites, type and antitype, consist? What is typed by the Kohathites' having no chariots and carrying their burdens on their shoulders? What did the Kohathite service type for the Gospel Age? What is typed by the Merarites' having chariots and by their services? What is typed by the Gershonites' having chariots and their services? What has our Lord had to do with these antitypes?

(7) How were the Gershonites subdivided, type and antitype? How were the Libnites subdivided, type and antitype? How were the Shimites subdivided, type and antitype? How have the officiating antitypical Levites and their helpers been typed? How have those been typed who ceased serving?

(8) What were the four subdivisions of the Kohathites? What do their names mean? Whose descendants alone were Amramite Levites? Why? Which was the chief Levite group? Why? Which was the chief subdivision of these? Why? Which antitypical subdivision of the Kohathites has done a service nearest like that of, and most helpful to, the Priests? Why did their service partake of such characteristics?

(9) How many subdivisions were there among the Amramites? What were they called? What and whom did the Gershonite Amramites type?

(10) What and whom did the Eliezerite Amramites type in these four groups?

(11) Why have the antitypical Amramites been the most helpful to the Priests? Whose experience illustrates this? Whom additionally have they helped? Along what lines especially?

(12) What does Izehar mean? What three things are symbolized by oil? Prove this. What is the general work of the antitypical Izeharites? What are the groups, type and antitype, of the Izeharites? Name some of the representatives of the three antitypical groups. Describe the three classes of Kohathite Izeharites, type and antitype, and name some of the latter, describing briefly their work.

(13) What does Hebron mean? How many families were there among the typical Hebronites? What kind of tentatively justified men, and how many classes of these did they type? Describe, type and antitype, each of these classes, mentioning individuals of each antitypical class. What class of writers have wrought in all departments of antitypical Hebronite activities? Mention some of them by name.

(14) Who were the fourth group of Kohathites? Of how many subdivisions did they consist? What does Uzziel mean? Who have the antitypical Uzzielites been? What two considerations seem to prove this? Explain the three subdivisions, type and antitype, of the Uzzielites, and mention some individuals of each of the antitypical subdivisions.

(15) State briefly the kind of work that each of the four groups of antitypical Kohathites had to do. In general, what kind of men were they? Why are these men to be considered the antitypical Kohathites?

(16) What was the third group of Levites? What were its two subdivisions? What is meant by the names of this group and its subdivisions? What is the relation of the antitypes of this group to the antitypes of the other two groups of Levites? What are the antitypes of the Mahlites? Explain their work in detail. What are their two kinds, type and antitype?

(17) What are the antitypes of the Mushites? How did they do their work before and since printing was invented?

How many kinds of Mushites, type and antitype, are there? What did each antitypical kind do?

(18) Who were the chiefs of the three Levite groups? What did their names mean? Whom did they type?

(19) How many groups, divisions, etc., of the Levites have so far been studied? According to 1 Chron. 23 and 24, how many others were there? What do all these total and type? What kind of Levitical sections did the twenty Levite leaders of 1 Chro. 23 and 24 type? What are the three subdivisions of antitypical Shimites? What do the four Shimite Levites of 1 Chro. 23: 10, 11 type? What may we gather from 1 Chro. 23: 30 as to the third and fourth of these?

(20) What do the two Gershonite descendants of Amram (1 Chro. 23: 16; 24: 20) type? What do the Eliezerite descendants of Amram (1 Chro. 23: 17) type? What do the two Korahite descendants of Izehar by Abiasaph (1 Chro. 23: 18; 24: 22) type? What do the four Elzaphanite descendants of Uzziel type?

(21) What do the five Mushite descendants of Merari (1 Chro. 24: 26, 27) type? What does the Mahlite descendant of Merari through Kish (1 Chro. 24: 29) type? How many Levite groups are given in the Bible?

(22) Briefly summarize the mutual activities of the three groups of antitypical Levites to one another, to the Priests and to the nominal people of God. From whom else have the Priests and the nominal people of God gotten help? What Priestly needs did the three antitypical Levite groups satisfy? What do these need-satisfying activities of such persons prove? What other considerations add force to the proof?

(23) What do and what do not the above Levite types mark? Give an example that illustrates this. How did many Gospel-Age Levites as such begin their careers? Into what did some of these develop? How will this principle as to fixed individuals apply to the Epiphany Levites? The Millennial Levites?

(24) Of whom and what kind of descriptions are given in Num. 3: 21-26 and in Num. 4: 21-28? How many Levites were in each group? What is typed by the difference in the numbers of the three groups? What is typed by the dwelling in the rear of the tabernacle? What other considerations

strengthen this thought? What does Eliasaph, the son of Lael, type?

(25) What is set forth in Num. 3: 25, 26? How do these verses differ from Num. 4: 25, 26? What do the articles that the Gershonites bore prove of the Gospel-Age Gershonites? In what two senses is the word tabernacle used in this connection? Who bore it in the restricted sense of that word? What did it type? What does this teach as to certain Gospel-Age Gershonite activities? How did they perform such services both to Spirit-begotten and Spirit-born persons?

(26) What was the second part of the Gershonite service? What did it type? Why? What is typed by its being white? Why? What is typed by one of its parts being doubled as a part of the front of the tabernacle? What things are typed by the Gershonites' bearing it? What was the third part of the tabernacle in the Gershonites' charge? What did it type? Why? What did its being red type? Why did it consist of ram skins? Explain the antitype of the Gershonites' bearing that ram-skin covering of the tabernacle. '

(27) What was the fourth part of the tabernacle in the Gershonites' charge? What did it type? What is typed by the Gershonites' having it in charge? What was the fifth and last part of the tabernacle proper in the Gershonites' charge? What did it type? What is typed by the Gershonites' having it in charge?

(28) Of what do Num. 3: 26 and 4: 26 treat? What does the latter give that the former omits? What do the court hangings type? What is typed by their being in the Gershonites' charge? What was the second court article in the Gershonites' charge? What did it type? What is typed by its being in the Gershonites' charge? What is the third thing of the court in the Gershonites' charge. Distinguish between these cords and those in the Merarites' charge. What do the cords in the formers' charge type? What is probably meant by their instruments? What did they probably type?

(29) What is manifest from a study of the parts of the tabernacle borne by the Gershonites? What do the pertinent symbolisms combined with the facts of the Gospel Age prove as to our view of the Gospel-Age Gershonites?

(30) Whom does Num. 3: 27-31 discuss? What does Num. 4: 1-20 give of them? What is represented by the Kohathites' dwelling on the south side of the tabernacle? What other reason can be given for this fact?

(31) Where is mention made of the articles carried by the Kohathites? What article of tabernacle furniture is not mentioned in Num. 3 and 4? What three reasons prove that the laver was in the Kohathites' charge? What was the first piece of furniture in the Kohathites' charge? What do the ark's chest, mercy-seat, cherubim and glory-light type? What is typed by the Kohathites' bearing the ark? How did the antitypical Gershonite Amramites and the Eliezerite Amramites bear the antitypical Ark?

(32) What were the antitypical Zichrite, Nephegite and Korahite Izeharites? How did the antitypical Zichrite Izeharites, the antitypical Nephegite Izeharites and the antitypical Korahite Izeharites bear the antitypical Ark?

(33) What were the antitypical Jekameamite, Jahazielite, Amariahite and Jeriahite Hebronites? How did each of these subdivisions bear the antitypical Ark? Describe a Jekameamite Hebronite's work.

(34) What were the antitypical Mishaelite, Elizaphanite and Zithrite Uzzielites? How did each one of these subdivisions bear the antitypical Ark?

(35) How did the typical Kohathites bear all the articles of the tabernacle's furniture with their pertinent vessels? What did this type? What do the antitypical facts prove as to this point?

(36) What was the second article of the tabernacle furniture borne by the Kohathites? What did the table type? How does the Christ class fulfill the antitype of the table? What is typed by the Kohathites' bearing the table? How did the antitypical Gershonite Amramites and the antitypical Eliezerite Amramites bear the antitypical Table?

(37) How have the antitypical Zichrite Izeharites, the antitypical Nephegite Izeharites and the antitypical Korahite Izeharites borne the antitypical Table? How have the Gospel-Age Hebronites borne the antitypical Table? How have the antitypical Mishaelite Uzzielites, the antitypical Elzaphanite Uzzielites and the antitypical Zithrite Uzzielites borne the antitypical Table?

(38) What was the third article of tabernacle furniture in the Kohathites' charge? What did it type? What is the difference in the activities of the antitypical Lampstand and the antitypical Table? What did the Kohathites' bearing the lampstand type? How have the antitypical Gershonite Amramites and the antitypical Eliezerite Amramites borne the antitypical Lampstand? How have the antitypical Zichrite Izeharites, the antitypical Nephegite Izeharites and the antitypical Korahite Izeharites borne the antitypical Lampstand? How have Gospel-Age Hebronites borne the antitypical Lampstand? Give some illustrations of their helpfulness. How have the Mishaelite Uzzielites, the Elzaphanite Uzzielites and the Zithrite Uzzielites borne the antitypical Lampstand?

(39) What was the fourth article of tabernacle furniture borne by the Kohathites? What does it type? What is typed by the Kohathites' bearing the golden altar? How did the two antitypical Amramite groups bear the antitypical Golden Altar? How did the three antitypical Izeharite groups bear the antitypical Golden Altar? How did the four antitypical Hebronite groups bear the antitypical Golden Altar? How did the three antitypical Uzzielite groups bear the antitypical Golden Altar?

(40) What was the fifth article of tabernacle furniture in the Kohathites' charge? What does it type? How has each subdivision of the four Kohathite divisions borne the antitypical Brazen Altar?

(41) What was the sixth and last article of tabernacle furniture in the Kohathites' charge? What were its parts? What did it, its water and its two parts represent? Show the reasonableness in each case. Briefly how did the subdivisions of the antitypical Kohathite divisions bear the antitypical Lever?

(42) What belonged to each one of these six pieces of furniture? Who bore these? What other Tabernacle feature was in the Kohathites' charge? Why are these not discussed in the article under study?

(43) What subject is treated parenthetically between the description of the Kohathites' and Merarites' work in Num. 3? What was Eleazar's relation to the Levites and their leaders? What does this type for the Gospel-Age Levites? What does this type for the Epiphany Levites?

Against whom actually is revolutionism against "that Servant's" teachings and arrangements? Why? Who is actually the source of the Epiphany oppositions to Levitical revolutionism?

(44) What phases of the Levites in Num. 3 have we thus far studied? What phase of the Levites in Num. 3 yet remains to be studied? What did the Mahlite and the Mushite Merarites type for the Gospel Age? What is typed by their being the least numerous of the three Levite groups? What did Zuriel, the son of Abihail, type? What is typed by the Merarites' dwelling to the North of the Tabernacle?

(45) Where do we find a record of the tabernacle parts in the Merarites' charge? What does the antitypical significance of these parts prove as to the work of the antitypical Merarites? What parts of the tabernacle did the Merarites have in their charge? How many boards, sets of bars and pillars were there in the tabernacle? What do they total? Why is it reasonable to understand them to type the 66 books of the Bible? How can we harmonize the thoughts that the nine pillars type New Creatures and nine Biblical books? What symbolism shows that the boards in the Holy do not type New Creatures in justified human bodies? Why not? What do the boards of both the Holy and the Most Holy not type? Why do the bars not type new creatures in the flesh or in the spirit? What do these considerations prove as to the pillars in contrast with the boards and bars? What consideration proves that they have a typology similar to that of the boards? Why do we conclude that the boards, pillars and bars type the 66 Biblical books? What does this prove as to the Apochryphal books?

(46) Viewed from the standpoint of pieces and from the standpoint of sets of rows, how many bars were there? Which of these numbers types the corresponding number of Biblical books? What kind of Biblical books do they type? What is typed by the golden rings that held the bars in place? What are the Biblical books typed by the bars? Compare and contrast these nine books with the other Biblical books, particularly with the eight mentioned by name in our study. Why are these nine books represented by bars and not by boards or pillars?

(47) Of what do six of these nine books consist? How many bars as pieces and as rows were there for each of the three tabernacle walls? Of what did the top, bottom and middle rows consist? What did the three middle bars type? What did the three top and the three bottom bars type? Why did not the top and the bottom bars consist of but one piece each, as did the middle bars? Explain the details of this symbolism.

(48) What two sets of things do the nine pillars type? How many books do the nine pillars type? Why are there just nine pillars? What do the five pillars in the Holy type? Who were their writers? What do the four pillars in the Most Holy type? What are these books and who were their writers? What is the first reason for placing the types of the five in the Holy and the types of the four in the Most Holy? What is the second and deeper reason for their respective places? What are the facts and the parallels proving that Jesus was the writer of Revelation? Who taught this view?

(49) What three things were attached to the pillars? Of what metal were they? What were the fillets? What was their office? What was the office of the golden hooks? What did those type that were on the pillars in the Holy and in the Most Holy? What was the office of the pillar chapiters? What does a golden crown symbolize? What do the golden crowns on the 24 elders symbolize? What do the golden chapiters on the pillars type? What is typed by the golden fillets? What three things corroborate this?

(50) What were the dimensions of the Most Holy? What was the width of its boards? How many boards were in its west wall? How much of the end boards of the west wall were visible from within the Most Holy? How many whole boards were in the north and in the south sides of the Most Holy? How much of the southeast and of the northeast corner boards were visible and invisible from within the Most Holy? Of how many books does the New Testament consist? By what 27 parts of the tabernacle are these 27 books typed? By what parts of the tabernacle are the five books of Moses typed? Why are the thirds of four of these placed in the corners of the Most Holy? How many Old Testament books have not yet been typically pointed out by pertinent tabernacle parts? By

what tabernacle parts are these remaining Old Testament books typed? What is a proper characterization of the symbolic features of the tabernacle boards, bars and pillars? Why, briefly, do they type the 66 Biblical books?

(51) What parts of the tabernacle framework have not yet been studied? Of what metals did the sockets consist? Which sockets only were of copper? What is typed by boards and pillars resting on the silver sockets? What is typed by the pillars resting on the copper sockets? What was the office of the two golden tenons? What two things did they type? What did their fitting in the sockets type? What is typed by their being equally distant apart?

(52) What does the above discussion of the tabernacle's framework show? Why is it necessary to understand the typical significance of each part of the tabernacle, its furniture, etc., in its relation to the three Levitical groups? What does the Merarites' part in the burden of the tabernacle's framework prove was not the work of the Gospel-Age Merarites? What does this leave them for their work? How is this work typed? How did they fulfill this part of their work throughout the Gospel Age?

(53) What other two kinds of work did the Gospel-Age Merarites do? In connection with what parts of the tabernacle was this typed? What did the court pillars type? Why were there 60 of them? In what books are the 60 groups of Levites corresponding to these 60 pillars named? What three kinds of things were on these 60 pillars? Of what metal were they? What was the office of the hooks? What do they type? What does their holding up the court curtains type? What two things did the silver chapiters of the court pillars type? For what were the court pillar fillets used? What did they type? What did their steadying the pillars type? Of what did the court sockets consist? What did they type? What was the office of the court cords? In what two positions were they? What did they type? What did they type in respect to these two positions? Give some illustrations of this. What two thoughts are typed by the copper pins? What is typed by the pillars, so constructed and supported, holding up the linen curtains?

(54) What is typed by the Merarites' having charge of the pillars, sockets, cords and pins? Who is typed by those

dwelling on the east side of the tabernacle? What does its east side type? What was the typical and antitypical penalty of any stranger drawing near to these? What was the exchange of the Levites for the firstborn not designed to type? What is typed by the redemption of the 273 surplus firstborns? What was the redemption price for each one?

(55) Where has the service of the Gospel-Age Kohathites been described? What was their service, type and antitype, and how did they perform it? What preceded their performing their service, type and antitype? What was the character of the priests' covering the furniture and vessels of the literal tabernacle? What is purposed in this article?

(56) What privilege has the Lord given as respects the antitypes of the vessels, the furniture and their covering? What does such a privilege imply? What do the vessels of the tabernacle type? What passage proves this? Show this. Prove the meanings of the antitypical censers, chargers and bowls. When did the Lord first give the full view of the antitypical vessels? What did the lack of such an understanding prevent previously?

(57) What Scripture gave the clue to the antitypes of all the vessels of the sanctuary, apart from the censers? How many sets of vessels, apart from censers, were connected with the furniture in the Holy and with the brazen altar? What four uses have the Scriptures, according to 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17? How are these related to the four sets of vessels apart from the censers? Why is this so? What other evidence is in line with this thought?

(58) What is typed by the priests' covering the vessels and the furniture? Why were these things covered, type and antitype? What did the covering of the vessels, type and antitype, do to them? How is this done by the Priests in the antitype (1) with the furniture? and (2) with the vessels? How does such priestly activity affect the non-priests? What verse shows this antitype? Briefly show how it proves this. What qualities in the non-priests make such a result inevitable? What is typed by the blue covering? By the seal skin covering?

(59) Briefly show how this is in line with 1 Cor. 2: 1-16.

Give some illustrations that show these lines of thought to be true. Who take part in such works?

(60) With what two kinds of material were all the vessels and furniture covered? What additional things were used in certain cases? What did the blue cloths and the seal skins always type?

(61) What have the explanations hitherto given made clear? What else is to be brought out in this study? What is represented by the Israelites' marching, encamping, breaking camp and erecting camp? Who began breaking camp, type and antitype? How was this done? In what order did breaking camp proceed? What did this type?

(62) What is typed by Aaron's and his sons' covering the ark with the second veil? What effect did this have on the antitypical Levites and Israelites? Why? How is this represented? What is represented by the final covering of blue? What do the staves of the ark type? Why? What is typed by their being placed by the priests in the ark's rings?

(63) What does the table represent? What is represented by covering it with blue? What is represented by putting the shewbread and the table's vessels on the blue cloth? What does each of the four sets of table vessels type? Why? What is typed by putting the scarlet cloth over the table and the vessels? What is typed by covering all of these things with seal skins? What is typed by the table's two staves, and by their insertion into its rings?

(64) What do the lampstand and its vessels type? What is the difference between the antitypical lampstand and table? What does each of the four kinds of lampstand vessels type? Why? What is typed by covering the lampstand and its vessels with blue cloth and with seal skins? What does the bar type? Why? What does placing them on a bar type?

(65) What do the golden altar and its vessels type? Prove by two lines of thought that the expression, "all the instruments of the ministry" in v. 12, means the vessels of the golden altar. What is lacking from the description of these vessels? Why do we hold that, apart from the censers, they were of four kinds?

(66) What is typed by covering the golden altar with blue cloth? With seal skins? What is typed by covering its vessels with blue cloth? With seal skins? What do the staves represent? What does their being placed in the rings by the priests represent? What is typed by the bar? Why? What is typed by placing the covered vessels of the golden altar on the bar?

(67) What does the brazen altar represent? What do its ashes represent? What is represented by their removal before the camp would move? Give some illustrations that clarify this answer.

(68) What kind of cloth was used to cover the brazen altar? What did each ingredient of its color, and its color itself, type? What is typed by covering the brazen altar with it? and with the seal skin?

(69) How many kinds of vessels were used in connection with the brazen altar? What does each of these type? Why? What do the staves type? What does their placing in the altar's rings type? What were the Levites not permitted to touch? What would happen if they did touch them? What is their antitype?

(70) Why is Eleazar's office work, type and antitype, introduced in this connection? Who were the antitypical Eleazar? What two lines of thought prove this?

(71) What third line of evidence proves it? What is typed by Eleazar having charge of the oil for the lamps? The sweet incense? The daily meat offering? Give the reason in each case.

(72) What is typed by Eleazar's having charge of the anointing oil? The tabernacle and its contents? The vessels and their contents? Prove the reasonableness of each answer. Sum up the three lines of evidences proving who the antitypical Eleazar was.

(73) What do vs. 17-20 contain? Whom do Moses and Aaron here type? In what two ways could the typical and the antitypical Kohathites have been cut off from their service? In what two ways could they be helped to preserve their standing as Kohathites? What two things should the Kohathites, type and antitype, not do? What

happened, if they did these two things, type and antitype? What is antitypical "gazing"?

(74) Even who were in Ex. 19: 21-25 forbidden to gaze? What is the relation of the Hebrew word translated "to see" in Num. 4: 20, and "to gaze" in Ex. 19: 21? What is typed by the people's and the priests' gazing in Ex. 19: 21-25? Who only of the Underpriests could directly approach the Lord during the Gospel Age for first seeing the new truths that were about to become clear, without the sin of speculation? What has happened to the others—those who have disregarded this admonition? What even has happened to still others—the worst gazers? At what periods has such gazing been especially manifest? What exhortation was given on this line during the Parousia? What exhortation is now in the Epiphany especially appropriate on this line?

(75) Of what character do the Epiphany presentations not partake? Why not? How should we use them?

HOLINESS on the head;
Light and perfections on the breast;
Harmonious bells below, not raising the dead,
To lead them unto life and rest,—
Thus are true Aarons drest.

Only another Head
I have, another Heart and Breast,
Another Music, making live, not dead,
Without whom I could have no rest,—
In Him I am well drest.

Christ is my only Head,
My alone only Heart and Breast,
My only Music, striking me even dead,
That to the old man I may rest,—
And be in Him new drest.

So, holy in my Head,
Perfect and light in my dear Breast,
My doctrine turned by Christ, who is not dead,
But lives in me while I do rest,—
Come, people: Aaron's drest.

CHAPTER III.
GOSPEL-AGE SINNERS AND NAZARITES.
Num. 5; 6.

THREE CLASSES OF GOSPEL-AGE SINNERS. CHURCH SINNERS. THE GOSPEL-AGE NAZARITES. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IT HAS been our privilege to expound in the preceding chapters Num. 1-4 and 26, from the standpoint of the type and the Gospel-Age antitype. In this chapter we trust to give, by God's grace, Num. 5 and 6 from the standpoint of the type and the Gospel-Age antitype. We believe that these seven and all other chapters of Numbers type also Epiphany and Millennial things; but we desire in this book on Numbers to emphasize the Gospel-Age antitypes. It will be recalled that we have pointed out that the Most Holy's corner boards, which are visible to the extent of one of their thirds from the Most Holy, type the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. It will also be recalled that in the same article it was stated that one of the Most Holy's pillars types Jesus as a Divine being and the book of Revelation as of His authorship, and that another of these pillars types St. Paul as a Divine being and the epistle to the Hebrews as of his authorship. From this standpoint, the relation of the book of Hebrews to the books of Exodus and Leviticus makes us think that the pillar representing it stood on the same side of the Most Holy as the corner boards that typed the books of Exodus and Leviticus. And because the book of Revelation sustains a similar relation to the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, we believe that the pillar representing the book of Revelation stood on the same side of the Most Holy on which the corner boards stood that typed the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy. Therefore the understanding of the antitypes of the things recorded in Numbers and Deuteronomy is of greatest importance to an understanding

of the Revelation. It is for this reason that we are in this volume expounding Numbers 1-14 and 26, and we, by grace Divine, perhaps in another volume will expound the Gospel-Age antitypes of the rest of Numbers. If it should fall to our lot to give the Church an exposition of the Revelation, these antitypes will be found very helpful as a preparation of the Church for a better appreciation of it.

(2) In Num. 5: 1-4 the three classes of Gospel-Age sinners who were to be disfellowshipped are typically set forth. They are typed by the lepers, those having an issue and those unclean by contact with the dead. The lepers types those New Creatures who lost their crowns, but not life, the individuals who will find themselves before the throne. That the lepers type the Great Company in their uncleansed condition, we construe from the type of Aaron (the Little Flock) and Miriam (the Great Company) faulting Moses (Jesus) (Num. 12: 1-16; see the next to the last chapter of this volume). Those with an issue type willful sinners, usually those of the Second Death class; because their infirmity was one whereby vitality, life, was leaving them, thus antityping those who lose life, though in some cases these do not type Second Deathers (Lev. 15: 2-15). Those defiled by the dead type justified ones who have become contaminated by more or less gross sin. When we look at the New Testament teachings we do find that they command us to withdraw our fellowship from uncleansed Great Company members (1 Cor. 5: 1-5, 13); the Second Deathers (2 Tim. 3: 5, 8); and the justified ones who impenitently give themselves to gross sin (1 Cor. 5: 11; comp. Rom. 12: 1). Thus not only the symbols used in Num. 5: 1-4, but also the direct teachings of the New Testament show that we are to withdraw fellowship from the uncleansed Great Company members, Second Deathers and impenitent sinners among the justified. The withdrawal of fellowship is typed by the expression, "put out of the camp" in vs. 2 and 3. In v. 3

the reason for this step is given by the Lord: "that they defile not their camps in the midst whereof I dwell." The presence of the antitypes of such people among the real or nominal people of God in the Gospel Age gives them an opportunity to contaminate with their defiled condition those not thus defiled and thus to dishonor God, who dwells among them. By such disfellowshipment the Lord who dwells among His people is glorified, and they are safeguarded from contamination, while if those sinners remain among the Lord's people in full fellowship, they will contaminate others and dishonor God. The children of Israel's (v. 4) obeying this charge types the fact that during the Gospel Age such sinners were disfellowshipped by both the real and the nominal people of God, *e.g.,* not only the true Church has disfellowshipped them, but also all denominations have regulations in their church laws covering such cases and have enforced them. Thus we see the fulfillment of the type of Num. 5: 1-4.

(3) In vs. 5-10 the Lord types, as far as concerns the Gospel Age, how its sinners should make restitution for their wrong-doings. In the type the charge was given that people should right the wrong that they committed by confessing the wrong-doing and giving the equivalent back, with 20 per cent. added, to the wronged person, or, if he no more lived, to his heir—next of kin (v. 7); but where this could not be done, the recompense should be made to the Lord at the hand of the priest together with the trespass offering (v. 8). For the Gospel Age, making good to the wronged party would mean that its sinners should acknowledge their wrongs to the Lord always and usually to the wronged party, but not when the wronged party would be injured or not benefited by the confession; and that they should make restitution to the extent of their ability. We say that confession should usually be made to the wronged party. There are times when only evil would result from such a confession, *e.g.,* when a husband or wife has been

unfaithful, it can only injure the innocent party to know it; therefore we believe in such a case the confession should be made not to the wronged spouse, but to God alone. Making restitution in the type antitypes first that the wrong-doer undoes his wrong to the extent of his ability, *e.g.*, if he has stolen or otherwise unjustly gotten the possessions of his neighbor, he should repay the principal and add as much more to it as is necessary to work the evil out of his own character; or if he has misrepresented another, he should recall his statements to all to whom he made them and should give the wronged person as good a certificate of character as he is able, etc. The 20 per cent., a multiple of 10, stands like 10 and its multiples, for full ability in natures lower than the Divine. Therefore it types that we are, in addition to undoing the wrong, *i.e.*, restoring the principal, to add as much as we can to work the evil out of our own characters.

(4) In the type if the wrong was of such a kind that it could not be made good to the wronged party or his heirs, then the sinner was to make it good to the Lord by giving to the priest the principal and 20 per cent. added (v. 8). This seems to type the thought that we are to root out of our characters the wrong qualities that led us to commit the sin in question, and make our characters as much better than they were before as we can, and do it as something that would honor God and benefit our Lord. Indeed, every reformatory act of ours honors God; for it repairs injury done to His image in us, and it benefits Christ as our High Priest; for it assists Him in His work of cleansing our characters. The ram of atonement (v. 8) types our Lord's sacrificed humanity—His merit. The sinner bringing the ram to the priest for his atonement represents us as coming to God in faith in Christ's merit, pleading for forgiveness on the basis of that merit; and the priest's making atonement by the ram of atonement for the wrong-doer represents our Lord's

imputing of His merit for the forgiveness of our sins, and thus satisfying God's justice on our behalf.

(5) Three distinct things, from among those that were brought by the people to the temple service (v. 9) are spoken of as belonging to the priest: (1) the heave offerings, (2) the hallowed, *i.e.,* consecrated things, and (3) the gifts for the priest. While treating of the heave offerings it might be well for us to mention and explain briefly, type and antitype, all the sacrifices: (1) the sin offerings, (2) burnt offerings, (3) peace offerings, (4) meat and drink offerings, (5) wave offerings, (6) heave offerings and (7) free will offerings. The sin offerings typed the humanity of Christ and the Church as working atonement. The burnt offerings represented these same sacrifices from the standpoint of their manifested acceptableness to the Lord. The peace offerings represented them from the standpoint that they were offered as a matter of covenant obligation assumed by Christ and the Church. The meat and drink offerings represent these sacrifices from the standpoint of the praise and worship that they bring to God in that they are offered by a declaration of His attributes in preaching His plan in its deeper (meat) and simpler (drink) truths and by a service of Him in advancing His plan. The wave offering represents the same sacrifices from the standpoint of their continuity unto a completion and their elevation of the offerer's character. The free will offering represents that their humanity is fieely, without constraint, offered up to God. And the heave offering represents that their humanity in its sacrifice yields honor unto God. This honoring of God is typed by heaving, *i.e.,* raising or exalting repeatedly the shoulder of the sacrifice heavenward by the priest. The heave offering, as a part of the sacrifice consisting of the right shoulder (Lev. 7: 32; Num. 6: 20), types the proper conduct—the shoulder, being a part of an animal's forelegs, in harmony with Scripture symbolism representing right conduct—of the sacrificer

as honoring God and Christ. Many other things, gifts like tithes, firstfruits, etc., given to the priest, are also Scripturally called heave offerings (Num. 18: 27, etc.). The heave offerings, hallowed things and gifts of vs. 9 and 10, for Gospel-Age purposes, therefore, represent the honors, services and joys that reforming sinners render Christ by their reformation and good conduct. Such honors, services and joys God desires Christ to have.

(6) From v. 11 to v. 31 certain Gospel-Age persons—denominational churches and the true Church in their relation to Christ, as His espoused—are typically set before us in the type of a wife, suspected of unfaithfulness to her husband and subjected to the test of a Divinely enjoined ordeal. Heathen ordeals and those which in the Dark Ages were practiced in Christendom always put the disadvantage on the accused. They required, *e.g.*, the victims to walk on burning coals, through flaming fires, to put their hands in boiling water, etc. If the victim was unburnt, uninjured and made no outcry, he was accounted innocent; but if he was hurt, injured or made an outcry, he was declared guilty, upon the theory that the gods or God would preserve the innocent harmless and painless, but would cause the guilty to suffer harm and unbearable pain! Of course, the whole principle on which such ordeals were based was wrong—a tempting of God in reality. But the only ordeal that the Bible commanded contained no such unreasonable elements as these. In the ordeal of Num. 5: 11-31, God agreed to work a miracle injurious to the guilty only, with no miracle at all to be wrought with the innocent during the ordeal, though, if necessary to make her fruitful, it would have been done. And when we see the antitype of this story, we will at once recognize the marvelous figure that the Lord wrought in connection with the ordeal now under consideration.

(7) First we will make a few general explanations, type and antitype; then we will proceed to an explanation,

type and antitype, of the details of Num. 5: 11-31. In this account we understand that the husband represents Christ as prospective Bridegroom; the suspected wife represents, if guilty, the denominational churches, if innocent, the true Church; the priest represents Christ as High Priest; and the ordeal represents the crucial tests put upon the denominational churches and the true Church to determine whether they have been loyal or not to Christ as the Heavenly Bridegroom. But one might object to the above setting of the antitypical Bridegroom that in the type the man is spoken of as the woman's husband, while in the antitype the marriage of the Lamb is not due until the end of the Age. To this objection we answer: In Israel the espoused as well as the married were considered man and wife (Gen. 29: 21; Deut. 22: 23, 24; Matt. 1: 20, 24). Therefore the law under consideration applied both to the espoused and to the married in Israel, and hence could very properly apply antitypically as given above. Again, it may be objected that the denominational churches are not espoused to Christ. To this we answer that each denominational movement began as a Little Flock movement and each denominational church contained members of the Little Flock after it became a sect, and all of them, as a whole, according to Rev. 1: 20, compare with Rev. 2 and 3, were by God recognized tentatively as the Church, and as such as His mouthpiece up to 1878. Hence the propriety of the denominational churches being recognized by Jesus as His espoused until in crucial trial unto a completion they were proven guilty of unfaithfulness on account of symbolic fornication with earthly institutions. And finally, some might object that it is unreasonable that Christ could be represented both by the husband and by the priest during the ordeal. To this we reply: In other types Christ from varied standpoints has been represented by two persons acting different parts in the same general transaction; hence there are for the above-suggested

setting Scriptural precedents. *e.g.*: In Num. 3: 5, 9, 10, Moses represents Christ as God's Executive, and Aaron represents Him as High Priest. In Deut. 31: 22, 23, Moses represents Christ both as Executive and as the Revealer of God's will, *i.e.,* Prophet, and Joshua represents Christ as the Captain of the Lord's army. Thus the above setting has Biblical analogy in support of its propriety.

(8) Having seen these generalities, let us now proceed to the details which we will find in perfect harmony with the setting "of things as given in the preceding paragraph. In vs. 12-14 there are set forth the circumstances under which the ordeal described in this section should be applied. It was not to be applied to a wife caught in the act of adultery; for in such cases the law prescribed stoning (Deut. 22: 22-24). It was to be applied to such wives of whom the husbands were suspicious, and from such suspicion became jealous, regardless of whether their wives were guilty or innocent; for the ordeal was appealed to in order to reveal their guilt or innocence. Antitypically we understand the guilty wife to represent the denominational churches which have committed fornication with the kings—the governmental, clerical and aristocratic organizations—of this earth, by becoming one with them in unholy alliances (Rev. 17: 5, 15-18; 18: 3, 9; 19: 2). The innocent wife types the true Church, which maintained her virgin purity by remaining separate from all worldly alliances, waiting in symbolic chastity for her complete union with her Lord at His Second Advent (2 Cor. 11: 2, 3; Rev. 19: 7, 8; 21: 2, 9-27). The fact that the typical husband did not know whether his suspicions were true or not types the fact, not that our Lord does not know whether symbolic fornication has been committed, but that He acts as though He did not know it, and therefore arranges to put her under crucial tests applied by God for an unanswerable demonstration of the guilt or innocence

of His espoused. The spirit of jealousy coming over the husband types our Lord's zeal for the symbolic chastity of His espoused and His not being satisfied with her without requiring and receiving its proof (v. 14).

(9) The husband's bringing his wife to the priest types (v. 15) our Lord as prospective Bridegroom bringing the denominational churches and the true Church to Himself as the High Priest; because as such He is God's Agent in disclosing the guilt or innocence of the suspected one. The offering that the husband brought, consisting of flour, was a meat offering, even as v. 15 in the Hebrew calls it twice *minchas*—meat offering. It being a tenth of an ephah—a tenth being a fraction in which the number ten is involved—represents that this offering was as much as power less than Divine could give. As we have seen, the meat offering types the worship and praise given to the Lord. To worship means to serve, and to praise means to reflect credit on someone. We serve God by advancing His plan, and praise Him by declaring His Word, which reflects credit upon Him—praises Him—in that it manifests His glorious wisdom, power, justice and love. Thus the meat offering represents our advancing God's plan and declaring God's Word—ministering to and spreading the Truth; hence the barley flour represents the Truth given by Christ to the denominational churches and to the true Church. To each denominational church a special truth has by Christ been entrusted, faithfully to administer as its stewardship. Thus to the Greek Catholic Church the doctrine that there is only one person in our Lord, as God's vicegerental Agent, to the Roman Catholic Church the doctrine that there is only one Church, to the Lutheran Church the doctrine of justification by faith alone, to the Reformed or Presbyterian Church the doctrine that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper represent the body and blood of Christ, to the

Baptist Church the doctrine that consecrated believers alone are to be baptized—immersed—etc., were committed. These doctrines are typed by the barley flour. The Parousia and the Epiphany Truth is the antitypical tenth of an ephah of barley flour given to the true Church in her ordeal, which has been given to her for six testful experiences—siftings—since *1874* and will continue with her while the Priests and the Levites are being completely separated as such.

(10) The fact that no oil was to be poured on the flour, and the fact that no frankincense was to be put upon it are likewise typical. Oil, among other things, types the spirit of understanding (Matt. 25: 1-12). Frankincense types praise, virtue. Thus the gold, frankincense and myrrh that the magi brought to the child Jesus (Matt. 2: 11) type the fact that the Faithful will bring their sacrificial sufferings (myrrh), their praises, virtues (frankincense), and their Divine (gold) New Creatures, as their best gifts to Christ. Similarly, the frankincense placed upon the shewbread types praise, virtue, the fruit of the Spirit, founded upon God's Word and developed in the Priests as they partake of the antitypical shewbread—the Word of God. There being no oil in the meat offering presented in the ordeal service types the fact that no denominational churches nor the true Church would have the spirit of understanding as to the significance of the special trial connected with the antitypical ordeal while it was going on; and there being no frankincense upon the meat offering types the fact that no new or increased virtues will be added to the offerer during the antitypical ordeal. In other words, there would be no increased knowledge or grace worked in the churches and the Church during the antitypical ordeal—they will have only what they had previously developed and had, as their support throughout their trial, which was to test them for their past acts along the lines of past attainments or lack of attainments;

even as at school we were tested in our examinations on our past work and attainments, and were given therein no new things and attainments. This is the reason for withholding the oil and frankincense from this ordeal meat offering, and the meaning of the expression (v. 15): "for it is a [meat] offering of (1) memorial [past privileges], (2) bringing iniquity to remembrance,"-literally, bringing to mind iniquity, *i.e.*., revealing past conduct. And, certainly, from experience we know this is true. None of us knew what the six siftings meant before we had been proven true amid them; nor did any of us add new graces to our characters while in the crucial trial of any of those siftings; but our past attainments were sorely tested therein. Thus in these siftings we offered the antitypical meal without antitypical oil and frankincense.

(11) The expression of v. 16, "The priest shall bring her near, and set her before the Lord," has the same general meaning as we found in Lev. 16: 20: "He [Aaron] shall bring the live goat near." It meant in the type that the priest undertook in connection with her to put her publicly into the position of one that was to undergo the ordeal in God's presence as a part of the Divine arrangement for such cases. In the antitype it means that the denominational churches and the true Church were put into such public circumstances connected with the Lord's service as brought them to the Lord's special attention for the purposes of putting them through the antitypical ordeal. It therefore meant their being publicly manipulated into such relations, circumstances and experiences as would favor their being put under the Lord's special observation into the crucial tests that would reveal their past course as to worldly affiliations and alliances. This will become clearer by several illustrations. When the Catholic Church was about to enter her crucial trials involved by the reformation through individuals in the 14th and 15th centuries,

through the conflict between Philip the Fair of France and Pope Boniface VIII a very public situation was created in religious respects [before the Lord], which later enabled Marsiglio to be the instrument of the Lord to test the Catholic Church crucially. Similarly, when the same kind of a testing was ministered through Wyclif, the shameless monetary exactions of the popes and begging friars in England and the conflict between contending claimants to the papal chair, furnished the setting for the antitypical ordeal in that it brought the Catholic Church prominently before the Lord and the public along these lines. Again, when the time came for Huss to be used as the Lord's instrument in applying the antitypical ordeal to the Catholic Church, the conflict between the reforming clerical party and the papal court culminating in calling the councils of Pisa, Constance and Basel furnished the situation that brought the Catholic Church "near and set her before the Lord." And back of all these circumstances was our Lord as High Priest manipulating the circumstances to create just such situations—bringing her near and setting her before the Lord. The same general features mark the situations when the Catholic and Protestant sects received their ordeals in the Reformation by sects, as also the same general features mark the circumstances that led up to the six siftings of the Parousia and Epiphany.

(12) The holy water that the priest put into an earthen vessel (v. 17) was taken from the laver; for that water was "holy"-consecrated to the Lord. Such water we understand to type the Truth (Eph. 5: 26; Heb. 10: 22), and that pertinent to the subject at hand. The earthen vessel into which the holy water was placed represents those "secondarily prophets" whom the Lord used as the special servants giving the truth applicable for the test, like Marsiglio, Wyclif, Huss, Wessel, Luther, Zwingli, Hubmaier, Servetus, Cranmer, Browne, Fox, Wesley, Stone, Miller, etc.

The dust from the floor of the tabernacle types the facts of Church History (Vol. Ill, Chap. II) pertinent to the teaching applicable to each case. Mixing it with the water types the fact that along with the presentation of the pertinent Scriptural teachings the facts of Church History would be used to show the history of the true doctrine and right practices, and of the false doctrine and the wrong practices as corroborative evidence of the innocence or guilt of the one undergoing the antitypical ordeal.

(13) For sake of emphasis the statement of v. 16, "set her before the Lord," is in substance repeated here in v. 18. Covering the head implies that the person so covered is in subjection. Thus in the Church meetings the sisters wear a head covering to symbolize that as the representatives of the Church they are subject to the brothers as representatives of Christ, *i.e.,* the Church is subject to Christ; while the brothers have their heads uncovered to symbolize that they as the representatives of Christ are free from subjection to the sisters as the representatives of the Church, *i.e.,* Christ is the Head of the Church (1 Cor. 11: 1-16). For the woman under the ordeal to have her head uncovered would fittingly represent what we know to be a fact in trial—the Lord permits each one to do just as he pleases; and each one in the trial actually does what he pleases, *i.e.,* does just what his previously developed heart and mind will prompt him to do. Consequently those who developed the selfish and worldly heart and mind will, as their will, fulfill the desires of self-will; and those who have developed the Lord's heart and mind will, as their will, fulfill the desires of the Spirit (Gal. 5: 16-18). The uncovered head of the guilty women would therefore type the fact that the denominational churches in the antitypical ordeal were given freedom to exercise their own free wills, which, through their developed selfish and worldly dispositions, made them manifest in the trial teachings and

practices contrary to the Lord's mind and heart. And the uncovered head of the innocent woman would therefore type the fact that the true Church in the antitypical ordeal was given freedom to exercise her own free will, which, through the developed spiritual mind and heart, prompted her to manifest in the trial teachings and practices harmonious with the Lord's mind and heart. Certainly history demonstrates such opposite exercise of their free wills to mark the denominational churches and the true Church during the antitypical ordeals; and this we believe shows our application to be Scriptural, reasonable and factual.

(14) V. 18 also tells us that the priest put the meat offering, both as a memorial offering and as a jealousy offering, in the woman's hands, before the ordeal. This suggests the thought that to each denominational church Christ gave its special truth, and to the true Church the Parousia and Epiphany Truth, for administration and service, before the ordeal; and, during the ordeal it serves as (1) a reminder of past privileges (memorial offering), and as (2) a revealer of past conduct (jealousy offering). This can be seen plainly in the history of each one of the denominational churches and of the true Church as having taken place. *e.g.*, the Roman Catholic Church before each one of her ordeal experiences stressed the doctrine of there being but one Church; the Lutheran Church before its ordeals stressed the doctrine of justification by faith alone, etc., and during the ordeal as a reminder of their past privileges and as a revealer of their past conduct. So the true Church during the Parousia was given the opportunity to stress before each ordeal connected with the five Parousia siftings the Parousia Truth, and during the ordeal as a reminder of past privileges and as a means of revealing past conduct. The same is true of her in the Epiphany so far as its ordeal has advanced. Not so to have done would have been contrary to the thought of bringing an antitypical

meat offering suitable for the Lord's altar. To do so would be fulfilling the picture given us of the woman before and while she was subject to the ordeal proper.

(15) V. 18 supplies still another item—the priest held in his hand the earthen vessel containing the water called, because of its effect on the guilty, "the bitter water that causeth the curse." Like every other feature of this chapter, this item is also typical. We have already seen that the vessel represents those "secondarily prophets" whom the Lord uses as special mouthpieces and through whom He gives the Truth and its Church History corroborations that reveal the guilt or innocence of the antitypical woman undergoing the antitypical ordeal. For the priest to hold this vessel in his hand implies that it was in his possession and power for ministering the testing and revealing water. His so holding this vessel types that our Lord Jesus holds such "secondarily prophets" in His possession and power for ministering the testing and revealing Truth and facts from Church History pertinent to the particular denominational church or true Church in the ordeal. This thought is, among other thoughts, included in the symbols of Rev. 1: 16, where our Lord is represented as holding in His hand the seven stars. We say that it is, *among other thoughts,* included in the thoughts of this verse, because this verse covers all the uses that the Lord has made of those symbolized by the seven stars, and these uses are broader than simply employing them to minister the testing and revealing truths during the antitypical ordeals. Our Lord holding these "secondarily prophets" as the antitypical vessel in His hand, implies that He protects, strengthens, enlightens and uses them efficiently to accomplish their intended service in connection with the antitypical ordeal, as well as directs, etc., other features of their work, teaching the Truth apart from ordeals and directing the general work of the Church in its other phases.

(16) Vs. 19-22 show how the priest put the woman under an oath by which she solemnly agreed to accept the issue of the ordeal as the Divinely given proof of innocence or guilt, accordingly as the issue would be favorable or unfavorable, v. 19 showing that no harm would come to the innocent, and vs. 20 to 22 showing that the guilty would become a curse and oath among her people, *i.e.,* an outcast and an object of execration, when manifested as guilty by the swelling of her belly and the shrinking (not rotting) of her thigh. Her saying, "Amen, amen," is her consent under oath to accept the issue of the ordeal as revealing her true character. Putting the woman under oath to accept the issue of the ordeal, and that as the Divinely directed proof of guilt or innocence, types the fact that our Lord as High Priest so manipulated circumstances when accusations of disloyalty to the Heavenly Bridegroom were made against the denominational churches and the true Church, that they were led solemnly to appeal to God as the witness of their innocence and to agree to stand test revelatory of innocence or guilt, binding themselves solemnly to abide by the issue of the ordeal and to accept vindication, if innocent, and condemnation, abhorrence, avoidance and execration by sister churches and the true Church, if proven guilty. Certain it is that every, denominational Church and also the true Church under accusation of disloyalty to the Heavenly Bridegroom were necessitated solemnly to deny the charge, appeal to God as the revealer of their condition as to the charge, and bind themselves to accept the issues of any test the Lord would bring upon them to manifest their guilt or innocence. This can be seen, *e.g.,* in the strenuous denials of disloyalty that were made by the Catholic Church under accusation, her appeals to God as her vindicator and her agreement to abide by the decision He would reveal, during the reformation by individuals and that by sects. The same things can be seen

in the course of the Lutheran Church, the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, etc., as it can be seen by the course of the true Church, both in the Parousia and the Epiphany sifting ordeals.

(17) It will be noticed that the innocent woman was assured that she would be unharmed by the ordeal; for the curse of the ordeal would come upon the guilty only. No miracle would be required to keep the innocent woman free from the curse, because the natural effect of drinking the water would not be the curse; for the curse could be effected by a miracle only. Consequently by this ordeal God agreed to work a miracle in the form of a curse to reveal the guilty. The curse affected not only primarily the person of the guilty, but also secondarily the esteem in which she had been held by her kinsfolk. If the woman was guilty, her belly was to swell and her thigh was to fall away, *i.e.,* shrink (see margin), so that she would henceforth limp. The translation "rot" is not correct here. All this of course is typical. No harm befalling the innocent woman types how the true Church would emerge from her crucial tests unscathed. When we look at the course of the true Church during the five completed siftings of the Parousia and during the incomplete sifting of the Epiphany, we will recognize that this has been true. Though sorely tested in these five ordeals, she emerged from every one of them uninjured; and by the time the sixth sifting is completed, she will have been found to be uninjured, even as we find her uninjured during the features of the sixth sifting that are already in the past.

(18) But not so with the denominational churches, every one of whom has committed symbolic fornication with the political, clerical, or aristocratic kings of the earth, *i.e..*, the political, clerical, or aristocratic institutions, like governments, clerical organizations, orders of nobility and aggregation of capitalists. In that these churches united with any one of these for any

reason whatsoever, they became disloyal to the Heavenly Bridegroom, and thus symbolic harlots, as they are expressly called in the Scriptures, especially in the Revelation. Not only is the guilty woman a type of these churches, but her primary punishments—the swelling of her belly and the shrinking of her thigh—are also typical of their untoward experiences. We will first consider the swollen belly. We understand it to represent corrupting of doctrine. This will become apparent if we remember that in Scripture, teachings are symbolically called food (Heb. 5: 12-14; Rev. 10: 9, 10; Is. 55: 1, 2; 65: 13, 14). Our foods go to, and are digested in, the belly. Hence by the figure of metonymy—the container for the thing contained—the belly in this passage is put for the corrupting food which caused the swelling to set in. Hence the swelling belly types the corruption of doctrine setting in as a result of the antitypical ordeal. Thus the Truth and facts of Church History that the Lord Jesus through His special mouthpieces gave to the pertinent churches at the time of their ordeal, coming in contact with the teachings held by these churches, turned them into more and more corruption and thus caused disease to spread throughout the teachings of these churches, even as the typical water corrupted more and more the contents of the woman's belly and made it swell.

(19) A few illustrations will clarify this. For example the Scriptural teachings on justification by faith alone-corroborated by facts of Church History-that the Lord Jesus gave through Luther, the earthen vessel, to bring into contact with the papal teachings on justification, occasioned such corruption of teaching in the papal system of doctrines that almost all her teachings were given a falser cast in order to evade the refutative Truth teachings on justification. So, too, when the Lord used Zwingli as the earthen vessel to present, as against Luther's false doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the bread and

wine, the Truth on the Lord's Supper—that the bread and wine are merely symbols of Christ's body and blood, which were not really present in the Lord's Supper—the Truth on this subject not only led Lutheran theologians to deeper corruptions on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but also on other matters, *e.g.,* it led them to teach as a basis for the real presence in the Lord's Supper the monstrous doctrine that now Jesus' humanity has the Divine attributes communicated to it, so that, *e.g.,* His humanity is everywhere present; also to teach the doctrine that Water Baptism and the Lord's Supper actually and inherently confer the grace of forgiveness of, and cleansing from, sin. Thus the symbolic belly of the Lutheran Church swelled, when the pertinent Truth was brought into contact with her errors. Again, when the Truth was given by the Lord Jesus through Robert Browne that elders and bishops were not the rulers of the ecclesias, but that each ecclesia under the Lord was to direct her own affairs—the Truth that the Lord gave to Congregationalists to conserve—the Episcopal Church that hitherto had made very little of Episcopal ordination and almost nothing of Apostolic succession, in contradiction began to develop the error of exclusive Episcopal ordination and the Apostolic succession of its bishops. Thus its symbolic belly swelled—its comparatively mild errors on these subjects became more and more corrupt, diseasing its whole theory of the church. These illustrations will clarify the antitype of the swelling belly.

(20) The second part of the primary curse was the falling away—the shrinking—of the thigh. As her belly swelled, the guilty woman became very unsightly; but when as a result of her shrunken thigh she limped, she became all the more unsightly, and of course was unable to conceal her guilt, which was plainly manifest from her physical deformities. With the loose fitting oriental clothes it was possible measurably to hide the swollen belly, but not to conceal the

limping walk of the guilty woman. In the symbols of the Bible, walking represents conduct, character; and the upright walk represents righteous, and the limping walk, unrighteous conduct and character (Ps. 26: 11; 56: 13; 78: 10; 84: 11; Prov. 2: 7; Jer. 6: 16; Nah. 2: 5; Rom. 8: 1, 4; Eph. 4: 17; Phil. 3: 18; Is. 35: 6; Heb. 12: 12, 13). We therefore would understand that the antitypical shrunken thigh types the unrighteous conduct that has marked every denominational church in the antitypical ordeal. Several illustrations will make this manifest. When the Lord Jesus put into John Huss as the earthen vessel the Truth on the nature of the Church—that it consists of the faithful elect, invisible to man but known to God—and through him brought this teaching in contact with the Catholic error that the true Church was the Roman Catholic hierarchy, not only was the Catholic Church in defense of her view led to resort to various false teachings in support of her false doctrine on this subject—the swollen belly; but also in order to put aside Huss' teachings, to burn him and his ablest supporter, Jerome of Prague, at the stake, the Council of Constance, as the official assembly of that Church, ordering them thus to be burned; and to seek by force of arms through Sigismund, the Emperor, to destroy Huss' followers, as such, in Bohemia, in some very cruel and unjust wars. Thus her antitypical shrunken thigh was manifest.

(21) Another example of the antitypical shrunken thigh we find in the way Servetus was treated by the Reformed or Presbyterian Church. When the Lord Jesus placed in Servetus as the earthen vessel the Truth refutative of trinitarianism, and when this refutative teaching came in contact with the Reformed leaders, Oecolampadius, Capito, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Farel, etc., they not only rejected it and resorted to fresh doctrinal twists to evade its refutative force; but those who survived until Servetus' second

literary attempt to set forth the Truth, about twenty-three years after the first literary attempt, *i.e.,* Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Farel, with the backing of Reformed theologians elsewhere, under the lead of Calvin, first betrayed Servetus to the Catholic Inquisition, from whose sentence to the stake Servetus escaped only through a timely flight from prison, then afterward at Geneva had him burned at the stake under exceptionally cruel circumstances, because of his anti-trinitarian teachings. Thus the Calvinistic Church in its ordeal experienced the swollen belly and the shrunken thigh. These examples will suffice to show how the denominational churches under ordeal of crucial trial underwent the antitypical belly-swelling and thigh-shrinking.

(22) V. 23 shows how typically the priest wrote the curses of the ordeal into the book, *i.e.,* the book of the law, and then with the water of the earthen vessel wiped the ink (so written in the book) into the water in the earthen vessel; for the statement literally is "and shall wipe [it] into the bitter waters." This was to show the woman that the curses were in harmony with the Law of God (shall write them in the book), and would with justice be mingled with the waters. Antitypically, our High Priest set forth these curses as harmonious with the Law of God, and has justly caused them to mingle with the pertinent truths and corroborations from Church History in the earthen vessel used with the pertinent antitypical guilty woman. As examples of these curses in the Lord's Word, we may cite Rev. 2: 20-23; 3: 15-17; 6: 8, compare with 13: 10; 17: 1-6. We know from experience and observation both in the Parousia as far as the denominational churches were concerned and in the Epiphany as far as the Great Company sects are concerned, that the Lord put such "ink" of the curses into the Truth and facts of Church History into the antitypical earthen vessel in His hand.

(23) The priest's causing the woman to drink the waters (v. 24) types our Lord's manipulating the pertinent truths in such ways as to bring them to the attention of the various denominations and the true Church at the time of the antitypical ordeal of each one. The water's becoming bitter to the guilty woman types how distasteful to the denominational churches and to the Great Company sects of the Epiphany the truths that oppose their errors became to them at the time of their ordeal.

(24) But before (v. 26) the waters were given to the woman to drink, the priest took the meat offering from the woman's hand and waved it before the Lord (v. 25), typing how our Lord would use continually (wave) in the Lord's service the special truths given to the denominational churches and the true Church as their stewardship. The fact that the denominations have mistaught on some subjects does not imply that the Lord would not use the truths that they did have and teach. For a long time using them as His mouthpiece (Rev. 2: 8, 10; 3: 16), He of necessity served —used those teachings for—the Lord's cause by the administration of these truths, and His long and rightly doing this is typed by the priest's waving the woman's meat offering before the Lord. His *bringing it near* (literal translation; only a handful was offered, see v. 26) to the altar (v. 25), represents our Lord as pointing out their relation to the Sin-offering as He administered such truths in the advancement of God's cause. The antitypes of this verse were in each case begun before the ordeal proper—the drinking of the water—was entered into. Hence the type (v. 26) states that the priest did that service before the woman drank the water.

(25) The priest's taking a handful of the meat offering (v. 26) as the memorial proper—typing that feature of the pertinent truth which was kept right and that assisted to bring out the fidelity or infidelity of

the antitypical woman, hence typically called "offering of memorial" (vs. 15, 18), represents our Lord's making a full and powerful use of such truths in the Lord's service. The priest's offering this as a perfume (literal rendering) to the Lord, types our Lord's offering to God through such truths a very acceptable sacrifice, He doing the sacrificing work as Leader and Director of the members of His body, who co-operated with and under Him in the pertinent sacrificial work. Such a service was indeed a sweet smelling savor unto the Lord (2 Cor. 2: 14-16; Rev. 8: 3-5).

(26) The woman's drinking (v. 27) the water types the denominational churches and the true Church taking note of and studying the testing truths set forth before them by our Lord through the pertinent servant at His disposal at the time in question. The guilty woman swelling in her belly and limping in her thigh, types the thoughts already explained above. Her becoming an oath and a curse to her people, her kinsfolk—the secondary curse—types how each denomination after being proven guilty of infidelity to the Heavenly Bridegroom, through her progressing in false teaching and committing added wrong acts, has become an object of solemn abhorrence and avoidance (the oath) and of deep execration (the curse) to the Lord's people, real and nominal, who eschew those particular forms of her symbolic fornication. Not only the true Church and many denominations eschew the fornication of the Catholic Church, but, *e.g.,* the true Church and the Congregationalist, Unitarian and Baptist churches eschew the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches, because of the fornication involved in their union of church and state in certain countries and in their union with the clericalistic institutions of Episcopacy and Presbyterism.

(27) The Lord in vindication of the innocent woman, not only preserved her from the swollen belly, the limping thigh and the shunning and execration of

her kinsfolk, but positively blessed her with motherhood (v. 28)—a thing especially desired by Israelitish wives in hope of their becoming the mother or at least ancestress of the Messiah. This was also typical, shadowing forth that the true Church would emerge from her trials not only free from the blame of infidelity, but from the bane of false teaching and wicked practices, and in due time from the abhorrence, avoidance and execration of others, but also fruitful in grace, knowledge and service. If we attentively consider how she emerged from each' one of the five siftings of the Parousia, it will be recognized that after each one she became very fruitful in knowledge, grace and service. The same thing is now partly true, and will eventually be fully true after the sixth sifting is over, as now we also see the Great Company sects with swollen bellies and shrunken thighs, and, as such, objects of abhorrence, avoidance and execration to the Faithful, in proportion as these at this incomplete stage of the sixth ordeal see the actual conditions.

(28) As the type made the ordeal described in this chapter obligatory ("this is the law, etc."—vs. 29, 30) on the jealous husband to require it, and on the suspected wife to submit to it, so Jehovah requires our Lord to test all churches claiming to be His espoused as above indicated, and requires every church to submit to this antitypical ordeal. And as the typical husband who fulfilled this law was absolved from guilt as well as the innocent wife, and as the guilty wife bore her iniquity (v. 31), so in the antitype. Jesus as Bridegroom, according to Scripture (Rev. 2: 20-23) and in harmony with the facts of Church History, some of which have been given above, faithfully fulfilled the antitype of this law as respects the husband and priest. Accordingly, He stands before God as a worthy and honorable Bridegroom and Priest. The true Church, according to Scripture and history, has fulfilled and is fulfilling her part in this antitypical

law, and therefore stands approved as a worthy and honorable Espoused. But each one of the denominational churches and each one of the Epiphany Great Company sects, while keeping this antitypical law is Scripturally and historically demonstrated as unfaithful, in that it has experienced and is experiencing the swollen belly, shrunken thigh and abhorrence, avoidance and execration of those not guilty of its particular form of symbolic fornication.

(29) Our study of six chapters of Numbers, in harmony with St. Paul's statement in Heb. 3 and 4, corroborates the thought that Fleshly Israel in Numbers types Spiritual Israel in the Gospel Age. The rest of Numbers is, among other things, also typical of Gospel-Age matters. It will be noted that the above applications are Scriptural, factual and reasonable, and in these qualities are quite different from the presentations so frequently made by the Levites, who seem to be suffering from an irresistible itch to rush into print, regardless of the unreasonableness of their views. How fully their effusions and conduct prove them to be swollen in belly and shrunken in thigh in their advancing into deeper darkness and in their wrongs against the Epiphany-enlightened saints, as the latter are serving the Lord's Truth now due for those to understand who have been faithful to the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren! May the Lord keep us faithful, and then will we be, after the ordeal and in each of its phases, fruitful in knowledge, grace and service.

(30) We have above pointed out the fact that the pillar in the Most Holy typing the book of Revelation, being over against the board typing the book of Numbers, represents the thought of the relation of these books to one another, and implies that the main things symbolized in Revelation are typed in Numbers. The seven churches of Rev. 1-3 in their activities symbolize the real and nominal people of God in their activities, just as the twelve tribes and the tribe of Levi in Num: 1-4

and 26 do in their activities. As the harlots of Revelation symbolize the unfaithful churches, so does the unfaithful spouse in Num. 5. As the chaste bride of Revelation symbolizes the true Church, so does the chaste spouse of Num. 5. As the bridegroom of Revelation represents our Lord, so does the bridegroom of Num. 5. And as the seven angels of the seven churches symbolize the Lord's special mouthpieces throughout the Gospel Age, so do the male Nazarites of Num. 6 type these same servants of the Truth. Our study of this chapter will serve to bring out this thought, and will thus be another evidence of the close relation between Revelation and Numbers.

(31) For a number of reasons we understand that the Nazarites type the servants of the Truth that God places in the Church for its upbuilding in grace, knowledge and service (1 Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 4: 11-13). That the Nazarites type special consecrated persons is evident from the fact that they were taken out of a consecrated nation, and by a *special* and *added* consecration ("When either man or woman shall make a special vow, the vow of a Nazarite, to separate himself unto Jehovah," Num. 6: 2, A. R. V.) were set aside unto the Lord; even as the Truth servants of the Church are taken out of a consecrated spiritual nation, and by a special and added consecration are set aside to serve the Body of Christ as its official servants. Their bringing a sin offering (v. 14) as distinct from a trespass offering proves that they type persons who share in the Gospel-Age atonement sacrifices, *i.e.,* Priests; while their bringing a ewe lamb as distinct from a male lamb, proves that they are but a part of the second Sin-offering, even as the female is represented Scripturally as being a part of the male (Gen. 2: 23; 1 Cor. 11: 7, 8, 12). Furthermore, the Nazarite's bringing no leavened loaf (Lev. 7: 11-14) with his peace offering (vs. 15, 19), proves that he does not type Millennial persons; while his not bringing an

unleavened cake (Lev. 8: 26) with his oiled cake and anointed wafer, proves that his particular kind of consecration types one that occurs in certain ones after they participate in that one typed in Lev. 8 as the priestly consecration, even as the special consecration of the servants of the Truth in the Church occurs after their priestly consecration. These reasons prove that the Nazarites type the servants of the Truth set by the Lord in the Church for its upbuilding (Eph. 4: 11-13), *i.e.,* the apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers—brethren separated by the Lord from the rest of the brethren, as their Divinely appointed teachers and servants, but not lords. A study of Num. 6 will show in detail that this understanding is correct. We will now proceed to such a study.

(32) V. 2 shows us that there were both male and female Nazarites. We understand the male Nazarites to type the same persons as are symbolized by the seven angels of the seven churches, *i.e.,* the twelve apostles and those of the "secondarily prophets" who have been the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand in their times—brethren like Polycarp, Irenaeus, Arius, Claudius of Turin, Berengar of Tours, Abelard, Peter Waldo, Marsiglio, Tauler, Wyclif, Huss, Wessel, Savronarola, Luther, Zwingli, Hubmaier, Servetus, Cranmer, Browne, Fox, Wesley, Stone, Miller, Russell, etc. The female Nazarites type (1) those of the "secondarily prophets" who were not the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand, like Mark, Luke, Barnabas, Titus, Timothy, Apollos, Silas, etc., in the Jewish Harvest and the pilgrims during our Pastor's day, (2) evangelists and (3) pastors and teachers. Our reason for so understanding the antitypes of the male and female Nazarites is because the Scriptures represent the female as the "weaker vessel," and the female Nazarites would, therefore, fittingly represent the less influential-powerful-servants of the Church, while the male Nazarites would fittingly represent the more

influential—powerful—servants of the Truth. The word *Nazarite* means one separated or consecrated. The A. R. V. properly translates this verse, and by its wording shows that the vow of a Nazarite was a special vow—"shall make a special vow—the vow of a Nazarite." A vow itself implies consecration (Ps. 116: 12-14), and a special vow would imply one that only special consecrated ones make, and this is just what our understanding of the antitypical Nazarites implies.

(33) Before entering into a discussion of v. 3, we desire to remark that after the second verse there is no more express reference to female Nazarites, which is confirmatory of our understanding that the male Nazarites type the seven angels of the seven churches, *i.e.*, the apostles and those "secondarily prophets" who have been the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand; for the relation of the book of Numbers to Revelation implies that the former refers to the same general things as the latter. Hence it should, among other things, give some details on the seven angels of the seven churches, which it does by describing their types in Num. 6 after v. 2. But while after v. 2 there is no reference made to female Nazarites, we are to understand that in the type the same general prohibitions and commands applied to them as to the male Nazarites, as is indicated by the connection between vs. 2 and 3, and that, accordingly, the same general antitypical prohibitions and commands have applied to their antitypes.

(34) Three things were prohibited the typical Nazarites: (1) indulgence in the direct or indirect products of the vine (vs. 3, 4); (2) cutting off their hair (v. 5); (3) defiling themselves by the dead (vs. 6-9). These three typical prohibitions, in harmony with Scriptural symbology, very fittingly represent three things prohibited all the Lord's people, but especially prohibited the servants of the Church—the apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. A

summary of the first prohibition is typically set forth in v. 4 when it says, "All the days of his separation shall he eat nothing that is made of the grape vine [literally, wine vine], from the kernels even to the husk." What does this grape vine represent? Certainly it does not type Christ, our Vine (John 15: 1-8); because *as such* the servants of the Truth, as branches of that Vine, would be incapable of eating therefrom, though as such they imbibe Its sap, which the Lord instead of prohibiting them gives them for their growth. But there is a vine other than the Vine of the Father's right hand planting, eating from whose products is prohibited all the Little Flock, but especially its servants—the vine of the earth (Rev. 14: 18, 19). Everything made from, or produced by, this vine of the earth—the counterfeit kingdom of God—is prohibited the servants of the Truth, because it would effect their misleading the Lord's people, who look to them for spiritual teaching and help. Therefore, the servants of the Church should beware of accepting anything that is characteristic of, produced by, or derived from, the vine of the earth.

(35) Certain details of these prohibited products of the vine of the earth are given in v. 3. Seven of such details are mentioned in this verse, all of them very significant for the antitype and confirmatory of our understanding that the Nazarites type the servants of the Truth in the Church. Of these seven details, the first four are grouped separately from the last three. The first four items in the first thing prohibited are wine and strong drink and vinegar of wine and vinegar of strong drink. Wine as a symbol, just like the vine, is in the Bible used in both a good sense and in a bad sense. In a good sense it symbolizes joy-producing truths, especially ethical truths—truths pertaining to good conduct and character—when used in connections with corn as symbolical of doctrinal Truth (Is. 25: 6; 55: 1; Joel 2: 19; 3: 18). In a bad sense it

symbolizes error, especially ethical error when used in connection with strong drink (Rev. 14: 8; 17: 2, 4; 18: 3; Is. 28: 1, 7). In Is. 28: 1-7, we are given a description of the clergy of Christendom drunk with ethical and doctrinal errors, under the symbols of the leaders of Ephraim drunk with wine and strong drink. Accordingly, we understand the wine of Num. 6: 3 to mean ethical errors, and the strong drink to mean doctrinal errors. As ethical errors we might point out the Roman Catholic teachings that divorce is *never* permissible, that persecution for dissent from papal doctrines, organization and practice is a good work, etc., and the Protestant teachings that the participation of the consecrated in war is right, and that to promote the reformation of people by legislation is a part of the Church's present work. Papal and Protestant doctrinal errors are so patent as to require no illustrations. By the vinegar of wine and the vinegar of strong drink, we understand teachings of the vine of the earth somewhat related to ethical and doctrinal errors, because the vinegar of wine and strong drink are related to wine and strong drink as their product. Thus we understand the vinegar of wine to represent Babylon's false corrections of misconduct and her supposed corrections of right conduct; while the vinegar of strong drink we understand to represent her attempted refutations of Truth attacks on her errors and her attempted refutations of truths. As examples of the former we may instance the false basis of the Papacy's objections to the divorce of Henry VIII, and her denouncing as revolutionism the reformatory works of Protestant leaders; and as examples of the latter, the Protestant attempted refutations of arguments against eternal torment and in favor of future probation may be given.

(36) In other words, these four prohibited things in the antitype are the counterfeits of the four uses that the servants of the Truth are to make of the Scriptures,

i.e., they are to use the Bible for inculcating doctrine, for refutation of error, for correction of misconduct and for instruction in righteousness (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17). But as the four prohibited antitypical things are the counterfeits of the four things for which the servants of the Truth are to use the Scriptures, it is self-evident that the antitypes of the wine, strong drink, vinegar of wine and vinegar of strong drink, are prohibited the antitypical Nazarites—the servants of the Truth in the Church. If they should accept (drink) Babylon's ethical, doctrinal, correctional and refutative errors, they would not only injure themselves, but also the Church. Hence, while such errors should be shunned by the entire priesthood, it is especially necessary that its teachers should shun them, because their acceptance and consequent teaching of them would be doubly injurious—injurious to themselves and injurious to the Church. That the Lord has given the antitypical prohibitions to the antitypical Nazarites is evident, among other things, from St. Paul's exhortations to Timothy and to Titus, and from our Lord's seven letters to the angels of the seven churches along these lines. Thus we see that the four suggested antitypes are not fanciful interpretations, nor wild speculations, but sober facts.

(37) The last three features forbidden in the first thing prohibited the typical Nazarites are: grape juice (liquor of grapes) and moist (fresh) and dried grapes (raisins). Since wine and strong drink, with their vinegars and grape juice, are all produced from grapes, either fresh or dried, the grapes must represent the source from which the antitypes of these five things flow, *i.e.,* the principles from which the errors of the vine of the earth flow. Consequently we understand these grapes to represent the false principles upon which Babylon's errors are built. *e.g.,* How many doctrinal, ethical, refutative and correctional errors have flown from Babylon's principle—an antitypical

grape—that the Church was commissioned to convert the world, and then rule over it 1,000 years before the Lord's Return—Post-Millennialism! How many errors have resulted from the higher-critical principle—an antitypical grape—that the principle of religious evolution operating in Israel forbids the acceptance of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch—the first five books of the Bible—since that principle requires centuries of development of a nation of slaves before they would be capable of *evolving* so complex a system of religion as is now contained in the Pentateuch!

(38) The dried grapes would type old Babylonian principles, like the Catholic teaching that Tradition is equally with Scripture a source and rule of faith and practice. The fresh grapes would type new Babylonian principles, like one that Mr. Panin contends for—that we are obligated to accept the Masoretic reading of the Hebrew text unless corrected by itself. This contention is made by him in order to force us to drink antitypical grape juice, *i.e.,* the acceptance of the 480 years—the present reading of 1 Kings 6: 1—as against the 580 years which the Bible data elsewhere shows to be correct. Grape juice, which is the unfermented product of the grape, therefore, types the immediate deduction of a false principle. It, therefore, types the less developed and minor errors of the vine of the earth as distinct from antitypical wine, strong drink and their vinegars—the fully developed—fermented—errors of Babylon. It is, of course, self-evident that the teachers of the Truth in the Church should not accept the old or new principles of the vine of the earth, or their immediate deductions, as, *e.g.,* The P. B. I. have done on Chronology, on Revelation and on Daniel. Thus our examination of vs. 3 and 4 prove that the teachers of the Church are to abstain from all forms of error and their underlying principles, as well as from the immediate deductions of the latter; and, therefore, by antithesis these verses imply that the

teachers of the Truth should hold to the Truth in all its forms, as well as to their underlying principles and the latters' immediate deductions. Undeniably these things are required of the teachers of the Church.

(39) The second thing prohibited the typical Nazarites was cutting their hair (v. 5). The expression, "All the days of his vow of separation," implies that Nazarite vows were fixed to periods of time, some of which were not, and some of which were, lifelong. As illustrations of the latter kind, we might cite the Nazarite vows—made for them in each case at first by their parents—of Samson, Samuel and John the Baptist, who were thus lifelong Nazarites—Nazarites from their birth. Usually Nazarite vows were assumed by adults, and that for a definite period in each case; but beyond that period the vow did not extend, unless it was broken, when it was renewed for the full period (v. 12). Lifelong Nazarite vows seem to type vows of classes of persons, extending over the whole period of their activity, *e.g.,* from the experiences of the Epiphany Samson we conclude that the Gospel-Age Samson types in the primary instance those "secondarily prophets" who functioned as the stars of the Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicean churches in their capacity of battling against sectarians as the oppressors of the Lord's people. Thus the antitypical Samson in Claudius of Turin killed the antitypical lion—the papacy—by refuting its mouthpieces on papal absolutism and idolism; in Berengar of Tours killed the antitypical thirty Philistines in the controversy on transubstantiation; burned down their fields and smote them with a great slaughter in Peter Abelard's attacks on papal principles and in Peter Waldo's exposure of the wrongs of the papacy; carried away the gates of antitypical Gaza by Marsiglio, Tauler, Wyclif and Huss forcing the pope and cardinals to submit to the reform agitations of the 14th and 15th centuries, culminating in the three reforming

councils of Pisa, Constance and Basel; in Luther, Hubmaier, Zwingli, Servetus, Cranmer, Browne, Fox, Wesley, Campbell and Miller, the instigators of the ten reform movements, broke the antitypical seven green withes—new doctrinal errors—with which sectarians sought to bind him, broke the new ropes—new erroneous arrangements—with which sectarians sought to bind him, and carried away by his official powers the antitypical Philistines' pin of the beam and web—their efforts to refute his reformatory teachings. But in these ten reformers he was made captive and deceived, when overcome by flatterers; and then he labored under restraints to give religious instruction to the sectarians; but in the angel of the Laodicean Church, since 1874 he has been pulling down Churchianity by its two pillars—apostate Catholicism and apostate Protestantism; and shortly after antitypical Gideon's Second Battle and antitypical John's rebuke and beheading are complete, the antitypical Philistine temple will be in utter ruins and the Laodicean messenger will as a public opponent of sectarian error cease his work.

(40) We have introduced this brief exposition of the primary antitypical Samson, because it well help us to a better understanding of the antitype of the second prohibition of Num. 6—not letting a razor come upon his head. In Samson's case we learn that his strength was in his hair (Judges 16: 17). The Nazarite's hair, therefore, typed the powers of the servants of the Church; and as the antitypical Nazarite's powers grew out of his office, so the Nazarite's head types the office of the antitypical Nazarites, out of which their powers grew, *e.g.*, the special powers of the apostolic office were, plenipotentiariship, inspiration, infallibility, binding and loosing, and bestowing the gifts of the Spirit, as the special powers of the office of the special "secondarily prophets" have been to act as the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand, with respect to the seasonal

teachings and works of their days. These powers grew out of their offices—symbolic heads. For the typical Nazarite to permit his locks to grow long types the fact that the antitypical Nazarites should continue to exercise and develop their official powers; and for the typical Nazarite to permit others to cut off his hair would type an antitypical Nazarite permitting others to make him cease exercising his official powers, as to cut them off himself would type an antitypical Nazarite giving up the exercise of his office powers. St. Paul, refusing to permit his apostolic powers to be taken from him, as the second epistle to the Corinthians and the epistle to the Galatians show him to have done, is an antitype of a Nazarite not allowing a razor to come upon his head; while the above-mentioned ten reformers in permitting their office powers to be taken from them by sectarians of their own movements, antitype a Nazarite allowing his hair to be cut off. The antitypical shearing would imply either a measure of unfaithfulness, or at least of carelessness (as typed in Samson), in the exercise of antitypical Nazarite powers, unless a direct command from the Lord would charge the antitypical Nazarite to permit it. John Wesel, in repudiating under the threats of the inquisition his teachings, and thus his office powers, seems to antitype a Nazarite who cut off his own locks. The Lord, by Sts. Paul and Peter, exhorting the servants of the Church to be faithful in using their office powers (1 Cor. 4: 1, 2; 1 Pet. 5: 1-4), and by St. Paul, saying to Timothy, "Do the work of an evangelist," "make full proof of thy ministry," in part antitypes Jehovah's charging the typical Nazarite to let his locks grow long. If we consider the explanations just made as to the antitypical Nazarite's head, hair, the latter's growing long, and its cutting off, we will readily recognize their Scripturalness, reasonablesness and factualness.

(41) The third prohibition of Num. 6 (vs. 6-9)

forbade the Nazarites to defile their heads by contact with, or to come into the presence of, the dead. Death coming to the whole race as a result of Adam's sin (Rom. 5: 12) , the dead type sin and sinners (Num. 19: 11-22). As to touch the dead made one typically unclean, so to "touch" sin and sinners, to fellowship in spirit with them, *i.e.,* to sin, makes one antitypically unclean, contaminates, defiles him. Vs. 7 and 8 show that to come in contact with the dead would make one unholy; and this proves sin and sinners are typed by the dead and that contact with them or being in their presence types the act of sinning. Sin is the universal defiler. It makes us unclean before God. Its defilement is fittingly typed by that of the dead; for death is its effect, (Rom. 6: 23; 5: 12; Gen. 2: 17). Therefore the prohibition of the Nazarite's coming in contact with, or in the presence of, the dead, types Jehovah's forbidding the servants of the Church to defile themselves by sin, contact with the dead typing a more serious sin than being in the dead's presence does. All will admit that God does this especially to the servants of the Church, though He also does this to all the members of the Church. The three antitypical Nazaritic prohibitions—not to accept false teachings, principles, and the latters' immediate deductions, not to give up or permit others to take away their official powers, and not to defile themselves with sin, all must admit embrace all God's prohibitions to His antitypical Nazarites; and these three prohibitions covering all the cases demonstrate that our understanding of the antitypical Nazarites is correct. Here is no fanciful interpretation; here is no wild speculation; rather here are only Scriptural, reasonable and factual interpretations presented for our acceptance.

(42) V. 6 shows that the prohibition of the typical defiling covered the whole period of the typical Nazariteship. This proves that the prohibition of the antitypical defiling covers the entire period of the antitypical

Nazariteship. God desires clean servants. "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord" (Is. 52: 11). Sin-defiled servants of the Lord are a hindrance to the free transmission of the Spirit and Word of the Lord, while clean servants of the Lord further His cause and bless those to whom they minister (2 Tim. 2: 21). Therefore God gave the typical and antitypical prohibitions as to defilement by the dead. Therefore, let the servants of the Church see to their freedom from sin's contamination.

(43) In v. 7 the Lord gives, as to typical defilement, particulars which the natural man would consider extreme; but they are inserted into the type to show that no matter how near the relationship with the dead might be, no defilement should be allowed to come therefrom—not even from contact with, or being in the presence of, a dead father, mother, brother, or sister. This seemingly extreme charge was because of the antitype. For spiritual contamination can very readily come from a dead spiritual father, mother, brother, or sister. Evidently, the dead spiritual father cannot be God, as the Father of the Truth servants; for in Him is no sin nor darkness at all. But the Scriptures speak of those whom God uses as ministering the begettal to us as our spiritual fathers. Thus St. Paul speaks of himself as the father of the Corinthian brethren, of Timothy, Titus and Onesimus, because he ministered the begettal to them (1 Cor. 4: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 2; Tit. 1: 4; Phile. 10). The dead father would thus represent such an one turning from the Lord to sin. We would, therefore, understand the prohibition of the Nazarite's defiling himself by his death father to type the prohibition of a Truth servant's permitting the one who ministered the begettal to him, but now spiritually dead, so to influence him as to drag him into sin after him. By the antitypical Nazarite's mother, we would not understand the Oath-bound Promises to be here meant; for there is no sin nor darkness in it. But as

the Scriptures speak of those who develop the embryo new creatures as their spiritual mothers (Gal. 4: 19, 27; Is. 54: 1, 5, 13, 17), so we would understand the dead mothers of the antitypical Nazarites to type such brethren as formerly nourished their spiritual lives and later fell away. The antitypical Nazarites should not touch or be in the presence of these-they should not allow them in their spiritual deadness to contaminate them with, or draw them into, sin. The dead brother types a sinning Little Flock member who was not a special helper to an antitypical Nazarite; and the dead sister types a Great Company member who has gone into sin (2 Cor. 6: 16-18). The antitypical Nazarite should not let such influence him into sin. Our Pastor has given expression to the substance of these thoughts in the Manna comment for Sept. 17, which please see.

(44) The reason why the typical Nazarite should not defile himself by the dead is "because the consecration of his God is upon his head," *i.e.,* because he is especially consecrated to God in an office which forbids such defilement. It is especially from this verse and v. 9 that we derive the thought that the Nazarite's head types the office of the Truth servant. The office of an antitypical Nazarite is a specially consecrated thing. Therefore God requires a special consecration of its incumbent for its possession and exercise. Hence the consecration of his God is upon his office; and thus this office is by God separated from sin unto good works. Therefore it should not be contaminated by sin, as the sin of an antitypical Nazarite would certainly contaminate his office—his antitypical head (v. 9). Hence it is very necessary that he be holy (set apart) unto the Lord for His purposes, all of which are holy and sinless, all the time he exercises his office; even as in the type the Nazarite had to be holy unto the Lord all the days of his separation.

(45) V. 9 shows that even a sudden, unexpected

death in the presence of a Nazarite would defile him: "If any man die very suddenly by [beside] him, etc." Such a sudden death would type a Truth servant's being overtaken unthoughtedly, unexpectedly by a sin. Peter's denial of our Lord was such a sin. It was committed unthoughtedly and without deliberation. He was surprised suddenly, and by fear did what afterward broke his heart as he deliberated thereon. In the type such an unexpected death defiled the Nazarite's head, and required him to shave his head on the day of his cleansing—the seventh day—in token that his Nazariteship was defiled and needed cleansing before it could be renewed. This types the fact that a Truth servant should recognize that even in being overtaken by a sin, he defiles his office and forfeits the right of holding the office, unless he cleanses himself and as a Truth servant gains forgiveness. His recognizing that he has forfeited his office by his sin is typed by the Nazarite's cutting his hair off; and the genuineness of his desire for reinstatement is proven by his cleansing himself of the sin. The completion of the cleansing on the evening of the seventh day (Num. 19: 19) types the fact that the antitypical Nazarite is by full reformation reckoned as living in the end of the Millennium as a restored—a sinless—human being.

(46) But to picture forth the thought that he as a consecrated person is likewise reckoned as living in the eighth thousand-years day, during which reckoned time our Lord continues to impute His merit for the members of His Body who have sinned after their consecration and Spirit-begettal (1 John 2: 1, 2), the atonement for the Nazarite's uncleanness was made on the eighth day (v. 10). And to picture forth the thought that the cleansed antitypical Nazarite is renewed in his office in the reckoned eighth thousand-years day, the renewal of the typical Nazarite's vow was made on the eighth day after his cleansing began. In the offerings, subsequent to the atonement day, the typical offerings,

cattle, sheep or fowl or fine flour, were severally offered according to the varying ability of the offerers—the rich bringing cattle, typical of the perfect sacrifices at the end of the Millennium, the middle class bringing sheep, typical of the consecrated services of the world about half way up restitution, and the poor bringing fowl or fine flour, typical of the services of those beginning restitution consecration. The fact that the typical Nazarite brought two turtle doves or two young pigeons (v. 10), types the deep self-humiliation of the defiled antitypical Nazarite; for he must consider himself as the worst of offenders, because of his greater light and grace. The priest to whom he brings them can type no one else than our Lord as our High Priest; for He alone makes atonement for others during the Gospel Age—the reckoned antitypical eighth day. The Nazarite's bringing the two fowl to the door of the tabernacle types the antitypical Nazarite's exercising repentance and cherishing the desire for forgiveness—justification from his sin. His bringing them to the priest types the antitypical Nazarite's faith in our Lord as his sin and death atoning High Priest.

(47) The priest's offering one fowl as a sin offering (v. 11) types our Lord's making available His sacrifice, which provides a merit sufficient to work forgiveness for the repentant and believing Truth servant; and his offering the other fowl as a burnt offering types the fact that the Lord's sacrifice, so made available, is manifested as acceptable to the Father on behalf of the repentant and believing Truth servant. The priest's making atonement for the Nazarite types our Lord's imputing His merit and thus actually atoning for the repentant and believing Truth servant. To show that the atonement covers only Adamic sins in the antitype, the statement is made that the atonement was made for the one who had sinned by the dead—as an Adamic sinner. And the priest's hallowing the head of the

Nazarite on that day—the eighth day—types the fact that the office of the antitypical Nazarite is again set apart for him—that he is reinstated into his office without prejudice to him. This entire transaction well types our Lord's mercy and faithfulness toward the offending, but repentant and believing Truth servant (Heb. 2: 17) , an example of which we see in His dealing with the Apostle Peter.

(48) The Nazarite's renewing his vow (v. 12) types the Truth servant anew dedicating himself to the Lord in his office. He must renew his devotion, and also recover the ground lost through the sin, and that with all faithfulness and zeal in living the Truth and in executing the responsibilities of his office, which is typed by the former days of the defiled Nazarite's vow not counting, and by his making the renewed vow for the full time formerly fixed by him. The Nazarite's bringing a ram of one year as a trespass offering types the fact that the offending, but repentant and believing Truth servant must not only undo the wrong which he committed, but also must root out of his character the evil quality or qualities from which the wrong flowed. This is more or less of a laborious process, requiring watching, praying, battling and persevering spiritual exercise; because these evil qualities are more or less entrenched in the disposition; and the devil, the world and the flesh struggle against his efforts to dislodge them. His bringing a *ram* as the trespass offering also types the Truth servant's faith in Christ's character which he pledges to imitate.

(49) The rest of the chapter beginning with v. 13. gives the law's requirement on the Nazarite when his vow was fulfilled. Actually, in the antitype the things represented by what was done on the day of the fulfilment of the typical vow are done from the outstart of the antitypical Nazarite's service. But the Lord in the type had them figured forth at the end in order to show the progressive work unto a completion in the

antitype. At least one of the things done in the type—the burning of the Nazarite's long hair under the peace offering—could not have been done at the beginning of his vow; for his hair was not then long, nor was it at that time hair which was grown during the Nazariteship. Sometimes the Lord presents a typical matter at the outstart of a typical service to show the finished work in the antitype, *e.g.*, Aaron robed in beauty and glory before his consecration and anointing was to show that God views "the things that be not, as though they were," in view of what they would be; and sometimes, as in the case before us, the Lord arranged a certain feature of a typical transaction at the end of a type, to show the progress of the antitype unto a completion. We will readily see this to be the case as we study the rest of this chapter, which describes the services of and for the Nazarite on the day his vow was completed. The last clause of v. 13 should be rendered, "he shall *cause himself to go* to the door of the tabernacle." He was not brought there, but went there of his own free will; and so in the antitype—the antitypical Nazarite is not forced to perform the service of his office, but willingly does it (1 Pet. 5: 2, 3); for he comes before the Lord and serves Him before His people willingly and openly.

(50) There are certain similarities and dissimilarities between the Nazarite's offerings in vs. 14-20 and those made for the priests at their consecration as given in Lev. 8; and the dissimilarities, as was seen above, enabled us to recognize the antitypical Nazarites. The fact that the types of the Church's sacrifice show many sacrifices, does not imply that there are many sacrifices of the Church; but they show various aspects of the one sacrifice of the Church, in which, of course, the Truth servants, the antitypical Nazarites, share. Thus the sin-offering types the *atoning* feature of the Church's one sacrifice; the burnt offering types its manifested acceptableness; the peace offering

or ram of consecration types the covenant obligations, vows, that it assumes in its sacrifice; the meat and drink offering types that the sacrifice is offered by spreading the simple and deep truths as due; the wave offering types the continuity and elevating character of its sacrifice; the heave offering types the glorification of God and Christ through its sacrifice being offered from holy qualities; and the fiee will offerings represent the spontaneity of its sacrifice. Most of these aspects of the part of the Church's sacrifice offered by the Truth servants are brought out typically in vs. 14-20. Thus the Nazarite brought as the burnt offering the he lamb of the first year without blemish to type the faith of the antitypical Nazarite in Christ's unblemished and mature merit as making his sacrifice *acceptable* before God. Thus the Nazarite brought the *ewe* lamb of the first year without blemish to type the sacrifice of the antitypical Nazarite as a part of the sin-atoning sacrifice of the Church. Its being one year old types the maturity of the antitypical Nazarite's sacrifice, and its being without blemish types that the antitypical Nazarite's sacrifice, covered by Christ's merit, is unblemished in God's sight (Heb. 13: 16; 1 Pet. 2: 5). The typical Nazarite's bringing the unblemished ram as a peace offering, types the Truth servants' assuming vows, covenant obligations, which they fulfill by faithfully ministering in their office.

(51) As we have seen, there was no cake of pure unleavened bread in the basket of unleavened bread that the Nazarite brought, as there was in the basket at the consecration of the priests (Lev. 8: 26); but the unleavened bread that he brought consisted of cakes of fine flour mingled with oil and wafers anointed with oil, just as were in the basket at the priests' consecration. This types the fact that the Nazarites as such appear on the scene of service some time after they as priests were consecrated, *i.e.,* sometime after their justified humanity (the cake of pure unleavened bread)

was offered in sacrifice. The Nazarite's cake mingled with oil types the same thing as the similar cake did at the priests' consecration—Spirit-begetting, sanctification. So, also, the Nazarite's wafer represents the same thing as the priests' wafer—the hope of glory, glorification. The meat offerings and drink offerings represent worship—service—and praise. We worship—serve—God by furthering His plan; and we praise Him when we declare His works which reveal His glorious attributes: wisdom, justice, love and power. In other words, serving and spreading the Truth are the antitypical meat and drink offering, the meat offerings—the solids—representing the deeper truths, and the drink offerings—the liquids—representing the simpler, the surface, truths. Thus the Nazarite's bringing the meat and drink offerings type the Truth servants' serving and declaring the deep and the surface truths of the Lord; and thereby they worship and praise God.

(52) The priest (v. 16) who presented the Nazarite's sacrifices represents our Lord as the High Priest of all the Under-priests, and therefore of the Truth servants—the antitypical Nazarites. The priest presenting the Nazarite's offerings types our High Priest offering the Truth servants' sacrifices, their co-operation with Him therein being represented by the Nazarite's bringing them, by his waving the sodden shoulder with the cake and wafer thereon together with the priest, and by his cutting off his hair and putting it on the fire under the peace offering. In what sense does Jesus offer the sacrifice of the Truth servants? By initiating every one of their sacrificial acts, *i.e.,* He plans their sacrificial acts; He manipulates them into the surroundings and circumstances calling for them; He enlightens their minds as to what and how to sacrifice; He arouses their New Creatures to do the sacrificial things; and He sustains them in such activities unto a completion. What is meant by their co-operating

with Him in the sacrifice? Their yielding their heads, hearts and all else they have to Him in the performance of the sacrificial acts? Those, among whom are the Amramites, are entirely mistaken who think that Jesus does all our sacrificing without our cooperation. Many Scriptures, *e.g.*, Heb. 13: 16, 17; 1 Pet. 2: 5, as well as the type that we are now examining, prove the reverse. Moreover, our experience proves the reverse; for we certainly join with Him in using up our all in spreading the Truth. We know by experience that we have as volunteers, sharp-shooters, colporteurs, conversers, teachers and preachers, declared the Truth, using, under our Lord, of our consecrated human all to perform these services. We praise the Lord that Jesus offers our sacrifices, and that we are privileged to co-operate with Him therein.

(53) The priest offering the Nazarite's sin-offering (v. 16) types that our Lord offers the sacrifice of the Truth servants as a part of the Church's Sin-offering; and His offering the Nazarite's burnt-offering types God through our Lord Jesus manifesting through the merit of Jesus' sacrifice the sacrifices of the Truth servants as acceptable to God. The priest offering the Nazarite's peace offering (v. 17) types our Lord enabling the Truth servants to fulfill the covenant obligations of their office—the promises, vows, that they made the Lord as to their office. The priest's doing this with the basket of unleavened cakes types the fact that our Lord enables the Truth servants to fulfill these vows as New Creatures in sanctification and in the hope of glory. The priest's offering the meat and drink offering with the peace offering types the fact that our Lord as the High Priest enables the Truth servants to know and declare the seasonal Truth in its deep and surface features.

(54) The Nazarite's shaving his hair (v. 18) was preparatory to his putting it into the fire under the peace offering, in order to facilitate the latter's burning.

The Nazarite's hair, as shown above, types the official powers of the Truth servants. These powers, of course, are used from the time of their reception even unto the end of their ministry to facilitate the fulfillment of the Truth servants' official obligations—burning the peace offering, which thought is typed by burning the hair in the fire under the peace offering. In the type the hair could not have been cut off at the beginning of the Nazarite's vow, for the two reasons above given, as well as for the reason that it would have been in violation of his vow. But Jehovah wisely arranged the type so as not to make it impinge against its own requirements and yet bring out the antitypical burning of the hair throughout the entire period of the antitypical Nazarite's service, by having the hair cut off and burned under the peace offering at the expiration of the vow period, the principle of a progressional work unto a completion being here used by Him, so as to make the type and antitype harmonious with one another without prejudice to the type. The Nazarite's shaving his head at the gate of the tabernacle types the fact that the Truth servants publicly, before the Lord's people, make their official powers available for the fulfillment of the obligations that they assumed when they accepted the office that the Lord gave them.

(55) Vs. 19 and 20 describe the wave offering: v. 19 showing the Nazarite's part, and v. 20 showing the priest's part therein. The shoulder of the ram is, of course, a part of one of its forelegs; and if a shoulder is mentioned as that of a human being, it would by relation suggest his arm and hand. In the symbols of the Bible, the arm represents power and the hand represents service. The powerful service of Truth servants is, therefore, typed by the sodden shoulder of the ram of the peace offering; and such a service he is to present continually (wave) before the Lord as long as his ministry lasts. The unleavened cake and wafer were placed on this shoulder to symbolize that this powerful

service continually presented before the Lord was that of a New Creature in sanctification and in hope of glory—of glorification. The wave offering being performed in the type after the Nazarite cut off his hair, is in perfect keeping with the antitype; for the Truth servants first begin to use their official powers (cut off the hairs and burn them under the peace offering) before they can offer a *continued* service (the wave offering).

(56) Not only did the Nazarite wave the wave offering; but the priest also did it (v. 20). This double participation was accomplished by the priest's putting his hands under those of the Nazarite, supporting, empowering and controlling him in the waving. And this is exactly what we know to be true in the antitype; therefore we infer that it was done in the type. By a somewhat different figure this is shown by our Lord's holding the seven stars in His right hand (Rev. 1: 16, 20; 2: 1). Thus our Lord, as the High Priest, has assisted, supported, empowered and controlled the Apostles and certain "secondarily prophets" as His special mouth, hand and eye, in their pertinent stages of the Church. The breast (which contains the organs of breathing) used in waving represents the intellectual faculties of the Truth servants in which is the Word of God—the breath of the Lord. The thigh (mistranslated *shoulder)* used in heaving, represents their heart faculties in which are the Spirit's qualities, the feet, legs, thighs, in the Bible symbolizing conduct, characteristics. The waving by the priest and the Nazarite represents continued use of the intellectual faculties of the Truth servants for the Lord's service; and the heaving of the thigh would, therefore, represent the raising of the Truth servants' graces to God in services that honor Him. When it is said that the sodden shoulder and the cake and wafer were the priest's, there is typed the fact that the Lord Jesus gets pleasure and service from the powerful works of

Truth performed by the antitypical Nazarites in their sanctification of the Spirit and in their hope of glorification. By the priest's getting as his the wave breast there is typed our Lord getting for the furtherance of His ministry the intellectual faculties of the antitypical Nazarites, for a continued work on behalf of God's plan; and when it is said that the priest received as his the heave thigh, there is typed the fact that our Lord has received honor and exaltation (heave) by the heart qualities and conduct—the graces of the Spirit expressed in the good deeds—of the antitypical Nazarites.

(57) The statement (v. 20) that after this the Nazarite might drink wine, does not type the thought that the antitypical Nazarites, after the completion of their service, may accept false teachings; but it calls attention to the fact that the person who had completed the above service was no longer a Nazarite, but was an ordinary Israelite, and, therefore, cannot type an antitypical Nazarite after fulfilling his office, like Sts. Paul and Peter, etc., after they left the earth. Another significant item is suggested in v. 21 by the expression, "beside that which his hand shall get." This implies that what is stated of him above was the minimum that he should offer; but that if able he should offer more. We understand this to represent that there would be degrees of development in antitypical Nazarites. And, of course, experience shows that this is true. As a class the Apostles were, except that Servant, the greatest of the antitypical Nazarites; and the antitypical male Nazarites have been greater than the antitypical female Nazarites. Moreover, in each class of antitypical Nazarites, certain ones' "hands"—service—brought them more than those of others. St. Paul was easily the greatest of the apostolic antitypical Nazarites, as our Pastor was the greatest of the special mouthpieces who were "secondarily prophets." The thought, therefore, is that some would be able to offer more because their hand—service—would get more,

would accomplish more. This thought also types the fact that the Lord advances His servants in proportion as their "hand shall get," or to put it in another form: in proportion to their use of their "pound" in His service.

(58) Vs. 22-27 give us a clue to the thought of our chapter, and glorious indeed are the thoughts that the Lord has typed in these verses. Jehovah commanded through Moses that Aaron and his sons should use the words of vs. 24-26 as their benediction on Israel, ever as Jesus as God's Executive has charged Himself as High Priest and His Body, especially the Truth servants, as under-priests, to confer blessing upon antitypical Israel. This blessing was, like those of Lev. 9: 22, 23, doubtless extended with hands uplifted toward Israel. At any rate, the antitypical blessing is conferred by the antitypical hands extended toward antitypical Israel, *i.e.,* the services—the hands—that Christ and the Church have performed have conveyed a blessing of a threefold character, as in the type. Each of the three parts of the blessing was twofold, and was so for good reasons. How have the antitypical Nazarites been blessing the people? (1) As Jehovah's agents they (a) led the amenable by repentance from the antitypical camp toward the gate of the antitypical court and (b) preserved them in that repentant attitude. (2) As Jehovah's agents they (a) led them to faith in Christ (through the gate), into justification—the antitypical court, and (b) through the antitypical court, giving them knowledge of the teachings centering in the Sin-offerings—the antitypical brazen altar—and helping them to cleanse themselves by the water of the Word—the antitypical laver. (3) As Jehovah's agents they (a) led them by consecration and Spirit-begetting into the antitypical Holy, and (b) there enlightened them with knowledge at the antitypical lampstand, strengthened them with grace at the antitypical table, and made them fruitful in service at the antitypical golden

altar unto their ending their sacrifice under the second vail. It is with these three forms of double blessing that especially the Truth servants have as Jehovah's agents blessed the blessable Israelites.

(59) With this statement of actual facts—antitypes—let us quote and in brackets briefly expound the Aaronic benediction, which we will find to type the bestowal of these facts or blessings. Incidentally, this explanation proves that this benediction has no reference to the trinity, as alleged by the Nominal Church. "The Lord bless thee [Jehovah by our services grant thee repentance], and keep thee [maintain thee in a reformed attitude against temptations to turn back into sin]. The Lord make His face shine upon thee [Jehovah by our services give thee tentative justification, smiling upon thee with a reconciled face], and be gracious unto thee [by giving thee a knowledge of all truths connected with justification, and by helping thee to love and practice righteousness and hate and forsake wickedness]. The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee [the Lord give thee grace for grace, *i.e.,* the high calling for thy justified human all which He first gave thee] and give thee peace [prosperity of the Spirit in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service]." Certainly, especially by the Truth servants, the Lord has wrought these blessings on antitypical Israel. And by conferring these blessings through their ministry of the Word these Truth servants have put God's name (character) on antitypical Israel, and thereby Jehovah has blessed antitypical Israel (v. 27). Praise our God, dear antitypical Israel, for antityping unto you the Aaronic benediction! Love and prize the still faithful antitypical Nazarites through whom He ministered this antitypical benediction; and, dear fellow antitypical Nazarites, let us faithfully serve antitypical Israel with our extended hands—our ministries—blessing them as Jehovah's agents, thus putting His character on them as the expression of His greatest blessing!

(1) What chapters of Numbers have we previously studied? From what standpoints and applications? What chapter, and from what standpoints and applications, does this study cover? How may the rest of Numbers be viewed? What are typed by certain corner boards and pillars in the Most Holy? What are the antitypical relations? Wherein will the study of Numbers and Deuteronomy help?

(2) Who are typed in Num. 5: 1-4? Prove this of each class. What is typed by expelling the unclean from the camp? Why should this be done? What does Israel's obeying the injunction type?

(3) What is typed in vs. 5-10? What four things were done in the type for wrong-doing? What does each one of these four things type? In what cases should confession to man not be made?

(4) What is typed by making restitution to God and the priest? What does our reformation do to God and Christ? What is typed by bringing the ram to the priest and his offering it for atonement?

(5) How many distinct things are mentioned in v. 9 as being the priest's? What do the seven kinds of sacrifices type? What was the heave offering, type and antitype? What else were called heave offerings? What do all these kinds type?

(6) What are typed in vs. 11-31? In what respects? How were they typed? What is an ordeal? Describe the ordeals of the heathen and of the Dark Ages in Christendom. Describe in contrast the only Biblical ordeal. What does its antitype enable us to recognize?

(7) How will we study vs. 11-31? What is typed by the husband, wife, priest and ordeal of Num. 5: 11-31? State and refute three objections to this setting.

(8) What is set forth in verses 12-14, type and antitype? What were these circumstances? What are typed by the guilty and the innocent woman? Where and how are the antitypes described? What is not and what is typed by the husband's ignorance of, and efforts to ascertain the true character of the wife?

(9) What is typed by the husband's bringing the wife to the priest? Why to the priest, type and antitype? What is typed by the offering, its being furnished by the husband,

its being a tenth ephah of flour? What was the antitypical meat offering of the Greek, Roman, Lutheran, Reformed and Baptist Churches, and of the true Church?

(10) Among other things, what do oil and frankincense type? Prove it. Why, type and antitype, were no oil and frankincense put on this meat offering? Explain the reasonableness and appropriateness of the antitype. What illustrates it? In what two ways did the meat offering serve?

(11) What is meant and typed by bringing the woman near before the Lord? Give three special examples from Church History wherein the antitype is seen. Give three general cases antitypical of this.

(12) Whence was the holy water obtained? Prove it. What does it type? Prove it. What does the earthen vessel type? Name some of these. What does the dust of the tabernacle's floor type? What does the mixing of the water and dust in the vessel type?

(13) Why is the fact of the woman's setting before the Lord stated again? What is symbolized by an uncovered and covered head? Prove it. What is typed by uncovering the woman's head? What would follow from this in the case of the antitypical guilty and innocent woman? Why? What corroborates this understanding?

(14) In what two capacities did this meat offering stand? What is typed by the priest's putting it in these capacities into the woman's hands before the ordeal proper? Give four illustrations of this. Why, positively and negatively, must this have been?

(15) What is typed by the priest holding in his hand the earthen vessel? Give and explain a passage which includes this, among other thoughts. What uses of the seven stars has the Lord made beside this?

(16) What was done to the woman, as is shown in vs. 19-22? What is the difference between v. 19 and vs. 20-22? What did she by being sworn agree to? What do the oath details type? Give some illustrations of these antitypical things implied in the oath, as acted out by the churches and the Church.

(17) How would drinking the water affect the innocent and the guilty woman? How was the difference effected? Wherein did the primary and the secondary working of the curse differ? Of what two parts did the primary curse consist?

What is typed by no harm and pain being experienced by the innocent woman? Show this from experiences in the Parousia and Epiphany. What will be found when the sixth sifting is over?

(18) What is meant by "the kings of the earth"? What is symbolic fornication? What are the guilty called in Revelation? What is typed by the swelling belly? Explain Scripturally the aptness of this picture. How does the belly symbolize teachings? How is the symbolic swelling effected?

(19) How has this occurred in the cases of the Catholic, Lutheran and Episcopal churches as illustrations of such belly-swelling?

(20) What was the second feature of the typical primary curse? What did it make impossible? What do walking, upright walking and limping walking symbolize? Show this from the Bible. What does the shrunken thigh type? Who have had it? Show this and the antitypical belly-swelling from the history of Huss and the Catholic Church, in the latter's dealings with Huss, Jerome of Prague and Huss' followers through the Emperor.

(21) Show this from the history of Servetus and the Reformed Church. How many special times did Servetus work literarily against trinitarianism? What Reformed leaders opposed him? What one at his second witness especially opposed him? What two efforts did Calvin make to destroy Servetus? How did he succeed in the second? What did his activity therein—approved by his fellow leaders—manifest?

(22) Into what book did the priest write? What did he write therein, and what did he do with the ink? What did such writing in the book indicate to the woman? What does the book, the writing and wiping the ink into the water type? In what book do we especially find these curses set forth? What on this line have we observed in the Parousia and the Epiphany?

(23) What is typed by the priest's causing the woman to drink, and by the water becoming bitter?

(24) Before causing the woman to drink, what did the priest first do with the meat offering? What does this type? What did not prevent our Lord from doing this? Prove this Scripturally. How is our Lord's doing this a

long time and in a right manner typed? What did the priest then do with the meat offering? What does this type? When were the two antitypical transactions performed relatively to the ordeal?

(25) What does the handful of meal type? What does the priest's taking it and offering it upon the altar type? What did the perfume of it type? Who co-operated with Him in this service?

(26) What is typed by the guilty woman's drinking the water? Repeat the antitypes of the swollen belly and the shrunken thigh. What was the secondary curse, type and antitype, in its two parts? Who are the antitypes of the kinsfolk? Give illustrations of the antitype as respects the kinsfolk of the Catholic, the Episcopal and the Presbyterian churches.

(27) From what evils did the Lord shield the innocent woman, type and antitype? What blessing did He give her, type and antitype? Give Parousia and Epiphany examples showing the antitype. What do we now see in Great Company sects?

(28) On whom were activities, involved in the ordeal, made obligatory, type and antitype? How would the complying husband, type and antitype, be regarded? What would the guilty woman, type and antitype, have to do? What say the Scriptures and Church History as to our Lord's compliance with the antitypical law? What kind of a Bridegroom and Priest does this prove Him to be? What say the Scriptures and Church History as to the Church's compliance with this law? What kind of an Espoused does this prove her to be?' What say the Scriptures and history of the compliance with this law on the part of each denominational church and each Great Company sect? What kind of an Espoused does this prove each of these to be?

(29) What thoughts are corroborated by our study of Num. 1-5; 26? From these chapters and Heb. 3 and 4, what may we infer as to the rest of Numbers? What is the character of the above presentations? In comparison with, and opposition to, them and their connected works, what do Levitical presentations and activities betray?

(30) What is typed by the pillar representing Revelation and the board representing Numbers, in the Holy of

Holies, abutting one another? What does this imply as to their symbolizations? Show this in the tribal relations, in the faithful and unfaithful marital, and the seven angels' and Nazarite relation.

(31) Whom do the Nazarites type? What proves that they type special consecrated persons? What offering of theirs proves that they type sin-atoners? What feature in this offering proves that they type only part of the Church? What thing lacking in their offering proves that they do not type Millennial-Age persons? What thing absent from, and what things present in, their offering, prove that they represent persons whose special activities begin some time after their priesthood began. Give illustrations of this.

(32) What does v. 2 specifically show? What do the male Nazarites type? What do the female Nazarites type? What is the basis for this difference between the two kinds of antitypical Nazarites? What does the word *Nazarite* mean? How does the Amer. Rev. Ver. translate part of v. 2? What does an ordinary vow type? What is typed by a special vow?

(33) What kind of Nazarites are mentioned nowhere else than in v. 2? To what kind does the rest of the chapter refer? What do these things typically prove? Why does the rest of the chapter refer to the male Nazarites exclusively? What teaching does the rest of the chapter give as to female Nazarites? How is this proved? What antitypical significance does this contain?

(34) What three things were prohibited the typical Nazarites? What does their prohibition imply in the antitype? What is the summary of the first prohibition? What does the vine of v. 4 not type? Why not? What does it type? Why? Why are its products prohibited the Truth servants? To what should this prohibition influence them?

(35) Where are the details of this prohibition given? What and how many are they? What do they typically prove? What groupings of these seven prohibited things are made? What are the first four? In how many and in what symbolic senses is wine used Scripturally? What is its good sense? Give Scriptural proofs for this. What is its bad sense? Give Scriptural proofs for this. What do the wine and strong drink of v. 3 type? Prove this from parallel passages. Give illustrations of some Catholic ethical

errors, also of some Protestant ethical errors. To what do the antitypical vinegar of wine and of strong drink stand related? What does the vinegar of wine type? Why? What does the vinegar of strong drink type? Why? Give some examples of Catholic antitypical vinegar of wine. Give examples of Protestant antitypical vinegar of strong drink.

(36) Of what are these four prohibited antitypes the counterfeits? Quote the Scripture that shows these. What should be said as to the propriety of prohibiting these four antitypes? Why should the Truth servants not accept the prohibited antitypes? Who in general and who in particular should shun them? Give some illustrations which prove that the Lord prohibits the Truth servants from imbibing these four kinds of erroneous teachings. What is and what is not the character of these interpretations?

(37) What are the last three prohibited features of the vine's products? What do the grapes type? Why? What antitypical grape has produced a multitude of Babylon's doctrinal, ethical, refutatory and correctional errors? What antitypical grape has produced errors as to the authorship of the Pentateuch?

(38) What do the dry grapes type? Give an illustration of an antitypical dried grape. What do the fresh grapes type? Give an illustration of an antitypical fresh grape. What does grape juice type? Why? What should Truth teachers not do with the antitypical fresh and dry grapes and grape juice? Summarize the antitypical teachings of vs. 3 and 4. What conclusion by contrast follows from these prohibitions?

(39) What was the second thing prohibited the Nazarites? What does the expression, "all the days of his vow of separation" imply? *As respects time* what two kinds of Nazarite vows were there? Give examples of the lifelong kind. Describe the other kind. What do lifelong Nazarites seem to type? How does the primary Gospel-Age Samson show this? Give some of the leading Gospel-Age experiences of the primary Gospel-Age Samson.

(40) Why has the Samson type been introduced into this article? From it what do we learn to be the antitype of the Nazarite's hair? What did the Nazarite's head type? Why? Show this from the powers of the Apostles

and the special "secondarily prophets." What is typed by the Nazarite's letting his hair grow long? What would be typed by its being cut off by himself? By others? How did St. Paul refuse to permit others to cut off his antitypical hair? How did the ten instigators of the ten reform movements permit theirs to be cut off? What would the cutting off of the antitypical hair imply in Truth servants? Under what sole condition would such implications not be present? Who cut off his antitypical hair? Give several antitypes of Jehovah's prohibiting the Nazarite's hair from being cut off. What judgment should we express as to the character of the explanation on the second Nazaritic prohibition?

(41) What was the third Nazaritic prohibition? What is typed by the dead? Prove the answer. What is typed by the Nazarite's being defiled by the dead? How do vs. 7 and 8 prove this? How was the Nazarite defiled by the dead—type and antitype? How many of the Lord's antitypical Nazaritic prohibitions are covered by the three typical Nazaritic prohibitions? What does this fact prove as to our explanations?

(42) How long did the third prohibition—type and antitype—apply? Why does God desire clean Truth servants? How should this influence Truth servants?

(43) What would the natural man think of the particulars in v. 7? Why were they inserted in the type and antitype? What are these particulars? Who are not and who are the antitypical dead father, mother, brother and sister? Prove the answer in each case. What is typed by the Nazarite's being defiled by his dead father, mother, brother and sister? Give a Manna comment that treats of the subject matter of this antitype.

(44) Why was a Nazarite not to defile himself with the dead? What do vs. 7 and 9 teach to be the antitype of the Nazarite's head? What is the character of a Truth servant's office, and what does it require of him? Why?

(45) Even what would defile a typical Nazarite? What does such a death type? Cite an illustrative example. What would such a death require of a Nazarite? When? What did these facts type? When was the typical cleansing completed? What does this type?

(46) What is typed by the Nazarite's renewing his vow,

and that on the eighth day? And by the priest's making atonement for him, and that on the eighth day? What were the three grades of offerings brought by Israelites? What did these type severally? What is typed by the typical Nazarite's bringing the fowl as offerings? Whom did the priest type? Prove this. What is typed by the Nazarite's bringing the offerings to the gate of the court? To the priest?

(47) What is typed by the priest's offering one fowl for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering? What is typed by the priest's making atonement for the Nazarite? How was atonement for Adamic sins thereby shown? What is typed by the priest's hallowing the Nazarite's head? And that on the eighth day? What does the entire transaction show?

(48) What is typed by the Nazarite's renewing his vow? What is typed by the former days' failing? By the Nazarite's bringing the ram as a trespass offering? What does the antitype imply? Why? What else is typed by his bringing a ram?

(49) Of what does the rest of the chapter treat? From what time onward are the antitypical things done? Why did the type require them to be done on the day the vow was fulfilled? What was Jehovah's viewpoint therein? What fact shows this? Give several illustrations of Jehovah's unusual typical viewpoints. What shows the second viewpoint to be the one used in Num. 6? What corrected translation is suggested in v. 13? What does the corrected clause teach—type and antitype?

(50) What are the similarities and dissimilarities between the offerings of vs. 14-20 and those made for the priests in Lev. 8? To what do the dissimilarities assist us? What do the many typical sacrifices not show, and what do they show as to the Church's sacrifice? Mention the seven kinds of typical sacrifices and explain them as showing seven features of the one sacrifice of the Church. What do vs. 14-20 bring out with reference to the antitypical Nazarite's sacrifice? Mention the Nazarite's offerings and explain their antitypical details in respect to the he lamb, the ewe lamb and the ram.

(51) What was present in the basket of Lev. 8: 26 that

was absent in the Nazarite's basket? What does its absence type? What is typed by his cake and wafer? What did the meat and drink offering type? How do they type these things? What is typed by the Nazarite's bringing them?

(52) Whom does the priest to whom they were brought type? What is typed by his presenting these offerings? How is the antitypical Nazarite's co-operation typed? How does Jesus offer their sacrifices? How do they co-operate with Him therein? What mistake has been made on this subject, especially by the Amramites? Give Scriptural and experimental proofs of the Truth on this subject.

(53) What is typed by the priest's offering the Nazarite's sin offering? burnt offering? peace offering? the basket of unleavened bread? the meat and drink offerings?

(54) Why did the Nazarite cut off his hair? What did his hair type? Why could not the hair have been cut off at the beginning of the vow? What is represented by its being burnt in the fire under the peace offering? What proves this? When did the antitype begin? How long did it continue? Explain the harmony of the hair's being burned at the end of the vow with the antitype. What is typed by cutting off his hair at the gate of the court?

(55) What is shown respectively in vs. 19 and 20? What does a shoulder imply, and what is thus symbolized by a shoulder? Why? What is typed by the Nazarite's waving the shoulder before the Lord, and that with the cake and wafer? Explain the appropriateness in the antitype of the wave offering occurring after the shaving.

(56) Who else participated in the wave offering? How was the double participation likely performed? What did the priest do for the Nazarite? What did this type? What other figure suggests the same thought? What does the wave breast represent? Why? What did the heave thigh represent? Why? What did waving the breast and heaving the thigh type? Why? What is typed by the shoulder, the unleavened bread, the wave breast and heave thigh being given the priest?

(57) What is not typed in v. 20 by the Nazarite's being allowed to drink wine? Why is the statement made? What is suggested by the expression, "beside that which his hand

shall get"? What did it type in classes and individuals? Give examples in proof. What other thought is implied in the antitype?

(58) What do vs. 22-27 furnish? Explain the commands through Moses to Aaron and his sons to bless—type and antitype. What conclusion should be drawn from Lev. 9: 22, 23 as to the use of the hands in conferring the typical and antitypical blessing? How many parts did the blessing contain? Of how many subdivisions did each part consist? What three works of blessing do the antitypical Nazarites perform toward antitypical Israel? What were the two parts of each?

(59) Quote the Aaronic benediction and briefly explain each of its three parts to bring out these three works of blessing, each one divided into two parts. By ministering these three double blessings what have the Truth servants put upon Israel? What two things should these considerations impel antitypical Israel to do? Antitypical Nazarites to do?

Blessed is the man who hath not walked astray
In counsel of the wicked, and in the way
Of sinners hath not stood, and in the seat
Of scorners hath not sat. But in the great
Jehovah's Law is ever his delight,
And in his Law he studies day and night.
He shall be as a tree which planted grows
By watery streams, and in his season knows
To yield his fruit, and his leaf shall not fall,
And what he takes in hand shall prosper all.
Not so the wicked, but as chaff which fanned
The wind drives, so the wicked shall not stand
In judgment, or abide their trial then,
Nor sinners in the assembly of just men.
For the Lord knows the upright way of the just;
And the way of bad men to ruin must.

CHAPTER IV
THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES.
Num. 7: 1-29.

THEIR JOINT OFFERINGS. THE OFFERINGS OF ANTITYPICAL NAHSHON. OF ANTITYPICAL NETHANEEL. OF ANTITYPICAL ELIAB BEREAN QUESTIONS.

ONE OF the most lengthy chapters of the Bible is Num. 7, which we desire to expound in this and in the following two chapters. We have already pointed out in a general way whom the twelve princes of Israel type—those who turned the twelve Little Flock movements into the twelve denominations of Christendom. The sectarian leaders are, therefore, in a general way, the antitypes of the twelve princes of Numbers 1 and 7. But further study, blessed by the Lord's enlightening grace, has enabled us to see more precisely just what kind of persons these antitypical princes were. From what Numbers 7 says of them from the standpoint of each one of them bringing a kid of the goats *for a sin offering* (vs. 16, 22, 28, etc.), we conclude (1) that they were of such as were of the Christ class, and (2) that they were of such as had lost their crowns, and thus in Num. 1, etc., are distinguished from Aaron, the type of the Christ class.

(2) But one may ask, If they were of those who had lost their crowns, how could they be represented at all as sharing in the Gospel-Age sin-offering? To this very natural question we give the following answer: All New Creatures whether crown-retainers or crown-losers, up to the time of dealing with the Great Company as a class, *i.e.,* up to 1917, when the New Creatures of crown-losers began to be put out of the antitypical Holy, were in the antitypical Holy as a part of the priesthood, and are so represented in the

tabernacle picture, when there is no reason for distinguishing them from the crown-retainers. It is only when there is some special reason for distinguishing them from the priesthood as crown-retainers that they are represented as out of the antitypical Holy and by others than the priesthood, as is done in this chapter with the twelve princes. We all recall how our Pastor repeatedly called our attention to the fact that there was in his days no Great Company as such, and that all New Creatures were in the Holy as a part of antitypical Aaron. The antitypical teachings of this chapter on the twelve Gospel-Age princes' bringing the antitypical kid of the goats for a sin-offering prove our Pastor's thought on this point to be correct. Why? Because during the Gospel-Age the Lord's Goat and what later became Azazel's Goat are typically called kids of the goats for sin-offerings (Lev. 16: 5); while from the standpoint of the finished picture only the Lord's Goat actually has been fully offered as a sin-offering. Hence before 1917 all crown-losers shared in sacrificing it, and hence as New Creatures were a part of antitypical Aaron, who alone sacrifices the Lord's Goat. Therefore we see that crown-losers were a part of antitypical Aaron, until from 1917 onward, when they began to be cast out of the antitypical Holy as New Creatures into the antitypical Court; while their humanity was being led out of the Court and delivered to the fit man. Accordingly, from the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture, we see that the twelve princes, in bringing the kids of the goats for a sin-offering, represent (1) Gospel-Age persons, (2) who share in the Sin-offering, (3) who are viewed as distinct from the Christ class, and (4) who must be New Creatures, as such only bring the sin-offering. In other words, the twelve princes for Gospel-Age purposes represent twelve sets of individuals who lost their crowns, who actually are, therefore, certain ones

of the Great Company, *i.e.*, those who perverted Little Flock movements into sectarian denominations.

(3) Several typical and antitypical illustrations will help us better to understand this thought. We have already pointed out the fact that when Abraham and Lot acted together in any Scriptural transaction, the former represents the Little Flock and the latter, the Great Company. We recall that Abraham's and Lot's herdsmen quarreled until a separation between their masters was necessary (Gen. 13: 5-12). Abraham's herdsmen represent Little Flock teachers and Lot's herdsmen represent Great Company teachers. The quarrel represents the controversies on the Truth between Little Flock and Great Company teachers. Similarly, Isaac represents the Little Flock and the Philistines represent sectarians (Gen. 26: 14-21). Isaac's herdsmen and the Philistine herdsmen also quarreled. This represents that the Little Flock teachers and the sectarian leaders, who were mainly Great Company members, would have controversies over the Truth. These controversies resulted in perverting Little Flock movements into sects; even as Abraham's and Isaac's herdsmen left the field to Lot's and the Philistine herdsmen respectively. Very many facts of Church history show the antitypical fulfillment. This we will show from some noted examples. Arius, a Little Flock teacher, with his colaborers, and Athanasius, a Great Company teacher, with his colaborers, strove together on the doctrine of Christ's person and relation to the Father, and as a result Greek Catholic sectarianism took immense strides forward on the trinity. Berengar of Tours, a Little Flock teacher, and his colaborers, and Lanfranc, a Great Company teacher, and his colaborers, strove together on the Lord's supper, and as a result Roman Catholic sectarianism leaped forward on transubstantiation. A little later Abelard, a Little Flock teacher, and his colaborers, and Bernard, a Great Company teacher, and his colaborers,

strove on the relation of faith and knowledge, and as a result Roman Catholicism became the advocate of deeper sectarianism in a superstitious faith as distinct from an intelligent faith. In each case the Little Flock herdsmen were driven back, and the Great Company herdsmen retained what seemed to them the prize of battle: Abraham and his herdsmen had the rocky high lands, Lot and his herdsmen had the green plains—but they pitched toward Sodom; and Isaac's herdsmen left the wells Esek [strife] and Sitnah [hatred] in the hands of the Philistine herdsmen. In these pictures, as in Num. 1 and 7, those who represent the Great Company teachers are not included among Abraham's and Isaac's herdsmen, but in certain ones foreign to them. This is because the design is to distinguish between them. If no such design had been intended, the distinction would not have been made; even as in the Aaron picture, when no distinction is intended, the crown-retainers and losers are represented in Aaron.

(4) While on this point we desire to give some examples—Calvin, Menno and Socinus—to show that they were not Little Flock members in the Jacob and Aaron types, but in the twelve-princes type. This was true; for each of these helped to make sects of their respective denominations. Thus Calvin sectarianized the Zwinglian movement into the Reformed or Presbyterian Church; Menno sectarianized the Hubmaier movement into the Baptist Church; and Socinus sectarianized the Servetus movement into the Unitarian Church. Thus these three are typed in three of the twelve princes of Israel, and not in Jacob in begetting his sons and in Aaron at the numbering of the Israelites. Hence we are to think of them as Great Company members at most; and in Socinus' case, he having renounced the ransom, we may doubt his being even in the Great Company.

(5) Above we have set forth our reasons for believing that certain of the crown-lost new creatures

(actually Great Company persons) in twelve groups are the antitypes of the twelve princes of the twelve tribes of Israel described in Num. 1 and 7. Accordingly, the antitypes of the offerings of the twelve princes, as described in Num. 7, are the things offered the Lord by twelve groups of Great Company leaders, one group for each of the twelve denominations of Christendom. With these preliminaries we now proceed to discuss the details brought out in this lengthy and interesting chapter, remembering that we are not studying the Epiphany, nor Millennial, but Gospel-Age antitypes of this chapter, even as our preceding consecutive studies in Numbers have had respect to the Gospel-Age antitypes.

(6) It will be recalled that we applied v. 1 to the Epiphany as a proof that, before the Epiphany chariots would be given to the Epiphany Levites (Vol. V, Chap. Ill), all the Little Flock would be sealed in the forehead, using the expression, "on the day that Moses had *fully set up the tabernacle* . . . the princes . . . offered, etc.," as the probative words. This proof we regard as correct. But that fact raises several questions: (1) If the day of the verse is the Epiphany, how can the passage be applied to the Gospel-Age? and (2) if applied to the Gospel-Age, how can the expression, fully set up the tabernacle, be true of the Gospel-Age prior to the Epiphany? In view of our method of proof above referred to, these questions naturally arise, but they are susceptible of satisfactory answers in harmony with our above-indicated thought. In answer to the first question we would say that as our former studies, covering Numbers 1-6 and 26, prove the threefold application—the Gospel Day, the Epiphany Day and the Millennial Day application—of the things there studied, so with the rest of the book of Numbers the same principle holds: it is a typical history of these three periods. The tabernacle setting of matters requires these three application to be true,

and the fulfilled facts of two of them prove the same thing; for not only, as will be shown in this chapter, have the Gospel-Age antitypes of this chapter been fulfilled; but part of their Epiphany applications have also occurred. Thus the tabernacle picture is by the fulfillments of the one entirely, and of the other partly, proven to be correct. But it is precisely this fact that emphasizes the second question; for on the surface its Epiphany application seems to deny the possibility of applying the words to the Gospel-Age, in view of the expression, "fully set up the tabernacle, etc."

(7) Here it behooves us to remember the proverb, "Who distinguishes well teaches well," if he rightly divides the Word of Truth (2 Tim. 2: 15). The following distinction will clarify the matter: (1) At Pentecost the entire Church of the Gospel-Age was set up *tentatively* and *representatively;* (2) By Sept. 16, 1914, the whole Church had been set up *tentatively* and *individually;* and (3) By the Millennium the entire Church will have been set up *unchangeably* and *individually*. A few explanations will help clarify these considerations. By the term *tentatively* we mean *probationarily*. At Pentecost, of course, the Church was set up probationarily. It was a conditional thing as to whether those who were there made parts of the Church would remain parts of the Church. Therefore, the Church in them was then set up tentatively. The same principle applies to the Church since Sept. 16, 1914, when the Epiphany first began to lap into the Parousia: Those then received into and those already in the Church embryo were on probation—they were only tentatively and not unchangeably a part of the Church. Not only was the Church set up tentatively at Pentecost, but also representatively, *i.e.*, the brethren in the upper room through the begettal of the Spirit were not only made the Church tentatively, but representatively; for from the Divine standpoint they stood at that time for the whole

Church. It is for this reason that the atonement type of the high priest sacrificing the Lord's goat pictures our Lord on Pentecost offering the whole Church to God (Heb. 7: 27). It is for this reason that St. Paul says of Him after His ascension that He purged our [the entire Church's] sins before He sat down at the right hand of God (Heb. 1: 3; 10: 14). Thus the entire Church is represented by the brethren in the upper room at Pentecost. For these reasons we said above that the entire Church was tentatively and representatively set up at Pentecost.

(8) But while the entire Church was set up tentatively and representatively at Pentecost, and tentatively but not representatively in the beginning of the Epiphany, it was set up individually as well as tentatively at the beginning of the Epiphany, *i.e.,* the full 144,000 who constitute and will forever constitute the Body of Christ were found by Sept. 16, 1914. Thus by that date all the individuals who will ever be of the 144,000 were in the Body. But some might ask: If by that date the entire Body of Christ was won, and none of them this side of the vail will thenceforth fall, how could they any more be spoken of as tentatively in the Body? We answer: God's foresight of their proving faithful did not make them unable to fall; for just as Christ Jesus who was foreseen by the Father as faithful unto death, and who was not thereby made unfallable, could have fallen, but was so faithful that He did not fall; so with those this side of the vail in the Body of Christ, since Sept. 16, 1914. They could be unfaithful, and thus fall, if they would; but they so faithfully do and will conduct themselves that they will not fall. Their not falling is not caused by God's foreknowing it, but God's foreknowledge of it is occasioned by their not falling; for if any of them would fall, God would have foreknown it as a result of what they would do. Thus by the beginning of the Epiphany the entire Church was won; and because

those this side of the vail added to those beyond the vail filled up the elect number, it is proper to speak of the entire Church as having been set up individually by the Epiphany. Of course, when the entire Church is beyond the vail it will be set up unchangeably as well as individually.

(9) Hence, from the standpoint of the three distinctions above made, we see the propriety of applying antitypically the expression, "*on* the day that Moses had *fully* set up the tabernacle," among other applications, to the Gospel-Age or Day. Applying this statement to its Gospel-Age antitype we would interpret it as follows: The Church as the antitypical tabernacle was fully set up tentatively and representatively at Pentecost, the first part of the Gospel Day or Age, by Christ as Jehovah's Executive, antitypical of Moses. During, and sometime after the beginning of, this day, which began at Jordan and first ended with Sept. 16, 1914, in the beginning of its lapping into the Epiphany, an offering was made by those New Creatures who lost their crowns, and who became sectarian leaders. The Church thus tentatively and representatively set up, had been anointed and sanctified both in itself as God's dwelling, revealing and blessing place [tabernacle], and in its various uses [instruments] and in its teachings [vessels] before the antitypical princes brought their offerings. To anoint the tentative and representative Church as the antitypical sanctuary means to develop the brethren who became the tentative and representative Church at Pentecost in the qualities and abilities of the Holy Spirit for the Church's mission as God's dwelling, revealing and blessing place in the Spirit (Is. 11: 2, 3; Eph. 2: 21, 22). To sanctify it as such means to separate it from selfishness and worldliness, especially as these were manifest in Judaism and heathenism, unto the purposes of God's dwelling, revealing and blessing place. The instruments of v. 1 seem to have special reference to the furniture of the

Most Holy and the Holy. Jesus as the only part of the Christ in the antitypical Ark at Pentecost, had, while in the flesh, undergone the antitypical anointing and sanctifying; and thus when He became the Ark He could have been spoken of as anointed. The tentative and representative Church on Pentecost became the lampstand in its capacity of enlightening the brethren, the table in its capacity of strengthening the brethren, and the altar in its capacity of comforting, encouraging, etc., the brethren. Its anointing in these three respects would mean its being given the qualities and capabilities of the Spirit to act efficiently in these three capacities; while its sanctification in these three respects would type its separation in them from self and the world, and its use in them for the Lord.

(10) The altar of v. 1 seems to refer to the brazen altar, and thus would typify the justified humanity of the Christ. This is anointed in the sense that the Christ is given the qualities and capacities of the Spirit for His sacrificial work as respects His humanity in making it act as a proper sacrifice should—energized for the Lord (Rom. 8: 10, 11). The sanctification of the altar would type the separation of the sacrificed humanity of the Christ from self and the world as well as from sin and error, unto sacrificial work for the Lord. The altar's vessels—five kinds in all—type the doctrines, refutations, corrections, instructions in righteousness and Bible passages, used in connection with the sacrifice of the Christ's humanity. The anointing of these vessels would type a use of them in harmony with the Spirit's qualities and capabilities and interpreting and using them in such harmony; while their sanctification would type their separation from self, the world, sin and error and their use for the Lord in deed and in truth.

(11) The connection between vs. 1 and 2 shows that all the acts of v. 1 precede the acts of the rest, of the chapter. In other words, it was to be *after* the

anointing and sanctification of the Pentecostal Church that the princes of antitypical Israel would bring their offerings. And this is exactly what the antitype shows to be the case, even as was the case with the type. In Chaps. I and III we have explained the antitypes of the princes. In the former reference we explained what is typed by their participation with Moses and Aaron in numbering the people, *i.e.,* describe, limit, define the sects and the appurtenances of each sect, each antitypical prince doing this to his antitypical tribe only. The present chapter, under the type of the offering of Israel's princes, shows how they did at least a part of the numbering antitypical of Num. 1 and 2. When v. 2 says that the typical princes offered, we are to understand it to type that the crown-lost leaders of the various sects performed a religious service for the Lord that was good and commendable. We are not to understand such offerings to be Azazelian in character, because as such they would not be offering unto the Lord, but unto Satan, whom Azazel's Goat actually serves. That the same class can render both kinds of service is due to their double-mindedness—the good part of their minds has served God in a measure, and the bad part of their minds has served Satan. In this chapter the good part of their service is set forth typically.

(12) V. 3 describes the first set of offerings that the typical princes brought—six wagons and twelve oxen. The statement that they brought them *before the Lord* types the fact that a service of God in religious respects is implied. And their bringing them *before the tabernacle* shows that it would be a public work in the domain of religion recognized as such by Christians, nominal and real, especially by the latter. Wagons or chariots (Ps. 46: 9) in the symbols of the Bible type organizations (2 Kings 8: 21; Is. 31: 1, see Berean comments; 66: 15; Rev. 18: 13). Hence the antitypes of the chariots here referred to must be certain organizations or classes of organizations that

leading Great Company members have developed during the Gospel-Age, and that have been serviceable to the Church. The wagons' being covered types the fact of their being protected or guarded by legal or other rights. In Biblical symbols draft animals as such represent teachings, principles and laws. Thus in the above-cited passages the horses type teachings, as is also manifest from other Scriptures (Rev. 6: 2, 4, 5, 8; 19: 11, 14, 21). Like horses, asses and oxen as beasts of draft, not oxen as sacrifices, seem to type teachings, principles and laws, *e.g.,* constitutions, or charters, and by-laws (Ps. 144: 14; Is. 30: 24; Jer. 51: 23). The fact that two princes brought a wagon types the thought that the various denominational leaders would have the same kinds of organizations for their differing denominations. And the fact that each prince brought his own ox and that no two united in bringing an ox, types the fact that the constitutions, or charters, and by-laws differ in each denomination from those in other denominations, the sectarian leaders accommodating them to the sectarian ideas of each separate denomination.

(13) In the preceding paragraph we defined the antitypical wagons as organizations. While this is true, it is not sufficiently specific in this instance, because there are many different kinds of organizations—many more than six. Nor is it sufficiently specific to say that they are religious organizations, since there are more than six kinds of these, *e.g.,* every one of the twelve denominations of Christendom is a religious organization; and it is very evident that these are not typed by the wagons, both from the disparity of the numbers, 6 and 12, and from the fact that the twelve tribes of Israel represent these twelve denominations in the tabernacle picture. From what is said in vs. 7 and 8 as to the disposal of the wagons—two of them given to the Gershonites, and four of them given to the Merarites for their services—and from the nature of the services of the Gospel-Age Gershonites and

Merarites (Chap. II), we conclude that these six wagons type (1) Missionary Societies, both home and foreign; (2) Clerical Societies, like ministerial conferences, synods, assemblies, etc., (3) Bible Societies, (4) Tract Societies, (5) Book-publishing Societies and (6) Periodical-publishing Societies. From this standpoint it becomes manifest that the oxen represent the constitutions, or charters in case of corporational Societies, and by-laws of these six mentioned kinds of societies; for constitutions, or charters, and by-laws do to such societies what the twelve oxen did to the six chariots—draw them on to carry out their functions, to forward their mission.

(14) We are not to understand that the six wagons here type six individual organizations, but six kinds of organizations, as is implied in the fact that all the denominations have the same six kinds of organizations. Thus there are many Missionary Societies, at least one general one and several special ones in each denomination. So, too, there are many Bible Societies, like the British and Foreign Bible Society, the American Bible Society, Prussian Bible Society, etc. The same remark applies to the other four kinds of societies above mentioned. It is these facts that lead us to think that the six wagons here type six *kinds* of organizations, not six individual organizations merely. So, too, the oxen here do not represent merely six constitutions, or charters, and six sets of by-laws; but six kinds of constitutions, or charters, each kind adapted to the pertinent kind of organization, and six kinds of sets of by-laws, each kind adapted to the pertinent organization. According to this the two oxen drawing each wagon would represent one kind of constitutions, or charters, and one kind of by-laws.

(15) When we speak of these six kinds of societies, we are to be understood as having the finished picture in mind. Actually such societies as are mentioned above have not existed from shortly after the Apostolic times.

They have, apart from the Clerical Societies, all come into existence within modern times. But bodies doing a similar work have been in existence since early in this Age; and these are included in this picture, though the finished picture exhibits the antitypical wagons in somewhat different forms. Thus for example various national Churches, like the Irish and British Churches, in sending out and supporting missionaries in the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries, were in effect Missionary Societies. Thus, too, various monastic orders that saw to the transcribing of Bibles, other Christian books and Christian tracts, were in this respect in effect Bible Societies, Book-publishing Societies and Tract Societies. In fact, business companies and even individuals that published such literature, like Samuel Bagster and Sons, Harper Brothers, Scribner's Sons, Tauchnitz, etc., very properly are included in these antitypical wagons, the viewpoint of the Lord being that all who engaged in such activities form groups which the Lord reckons as societies. Periodical-publishing Societies, of course, did not come into existence until about two centuries ago, and they, like the Bible, tract and book publishers, include as an antitypical wagon, not only publishing societies, but non-priestly firms and individuals who publish periodicals. A Priest, like our Pastor, publishing his priestly writings would not be considered as a part of this antitype; for it refers to Levite work.

(16) Vs. 4—8 show the disposal made of the wagons. Jehovah was pleased (vs. 4, 5) to charge Moses to accept the wagons from the princes for the service of the tabernacle, typing the fact that Jehovah accepted for the service of the antitypical Tabernacle—the Church—the offering of the antitypical wagons from the sectarian Great Company leaders in the various denominations, and charged our Lord Jesus to receive such antitypical wagons for such service. His charging Moses to give them to the Levites, types Jehovah's

charging our Lord to give the six kinds of organizations to the antitypical Levites—the faith-justified ones—who could avail themselves of such organizations for their particular work. His charging Moses to give them to the Levites according to their service (v. 5) restricted the wagons to the Gershonite and Merarite Levites; for the weight and bulk of the parts of the tabernacle which they had to bear made it impossible for them to carry them on their shoulders. Hence the wagons and oxen were given to these Levitical subdivisions only, as vs. 6-8 show: two wagons and four oxen going to the Gershonites (the weight and bulk of their part of the service—the curtains, cords and their appurtenances—required no more than two wagons and four oxen), and four wagons and eight oxen going to the Merarites (the weight and bulk of their part of the service—boards, bars, pillars, posts and their appurtenances, being especially heavy, required no less than four wagons and eight oxen). These wagons and oxen were given these Levitical subdivisions by Moses through the agency of Ithamar (v. 8), who had charge of the Gershonite and Merarite Levites (Num. 4: 28, 33).

(17) Remembering that the Gershonite part of the service in the tabernacle typed (Chap. II) the work of bringing people to justification and consecration, we can very readily see in what the antitypical Gershonites needed help—they needed help (1) in their home missionary (evangelistic) and foreign missionary work. Hence they needed the help of home and foreign Missionary Societies, or their equivalents as shown above. Therefore, the Lord saw to it that they received the help of such organizations. Hence we understand that one of the wagons given to the Gershonites (the Libnite Gershonites) typed the Missionary Societies; and the oxen of that wagon typed the pertinent constitutions, or charters if they were incorporated, and the pertinent sets of by-laws. This, the first antitypical wagon, served them in their work of bringing

people to justification. But the antitypical Gershonites needed help (2) in their work of developing people from justification to consecration—the work of the antitypical Shimite Gershonites. Hence the antitypical Gershonites need a second antitypical wagon—Pastoral or Clerical Societies: ministerial conferences, synods, assemblies, etc., supporting them in their pastoral and congregational labors whereby they sought to lead the justified unto consecration. The pertinent antitypical oxen were the constitutions, or charters if these societies were incorporated, and by-laws of these societies. Without the help of these two antitypical wagons, the two groups of antitypical Gershonites could not have done their Divinely authorized work.

(18) The antitypical Mushite Merarites had the work of publishing; and the antitypical Mahlite Merarites had the work of editing, (1) Bibles, (2) tracts, (3) Christian books and (4) periodicals. This we saw in detail in Chap. II. Thus they have had a fourfold work to do for the antitypical Tabernacle. And this fourfold activity of theirs suggests to us the antitype of the four wagons given to the Merarites. The Bible Societies have been necessary to produce the millions of Bibles needed for the Lord's work. The Tract Societies have been needed to produce the billions of tracts needed for the Lord's work. The Book-publishing Societies have been needed to produce the millions of books needed for the Lord's work; and the Periodical-publishing Societies have been needed to produce the millions of magazines and papers needed for the Lord's work. The constitutions, or charters if incorporation was necessary, and by-laws for each of these four antitypical wagons, were the antitypes of the eight oxen given to the Merarites. Each set of these antitypical oxen was adapted to the needs of its particular symbolic wagon.

(19) We understand that for the Gospel-Age Ithamar [*isle or land of palms, i.e.*, the one who has to do with the palm bearing (Great Company) class (Rev. 7: 9)]

types the stars of the five stages of the Church between the Harvests—those "secondarily prophets" whom the Lord used as His special eye, hand and mouth to the rest of the brethren during the Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis and Philadelphia stages of the Church, Eleazar representing the stars of the two reaping periods. Moses' giving the wagons and oxen to the Gershonites and Merarites through Ithamar, represents our Lord's paving the way for the antitypical Gershonites and Merarites to receive, and encouraging and arousing them through the above-described five stars to avail themselves of the use of, the above-mentioned societies or their equivalents in the work that the Lord gave them to do. *E.g.*, the twelve great reformers, Luther, etc., arranged for and encouraged and aroused them to use these antitypical wagons.

(20) V. 9 assures us that the Kohathites did not receive any wagons and oxen, because their part of the sanctuary's service was to be carried on their shoulders. Thus they typed that, as distinct from the other antitypical Levites, the antitypical Kohathite work was a personal one; and, by several of the typical Kohathites' carrying one piece of furniture or one set of vessels on their shoulders between them, they showed a co-operation of individuals; and thereby they typed the fact that antitypical Kohathites would act co-operatively as well as individually. When we look at the nature of the antitypical Kohathite work (Chap. II)—producing the (1) linguistical (Amramites), (2) interpretational (Izeharites), (3) historical (Hebronites) and (4) systematical (Uzzielites) lectures and works with reference to the Bible and the Christian Religion as a service of the antitypical tabernacle, we see at once that they do not need organizations to do their work. How could an organization directly write books and deliver lectures? Manifestly this is personal work, and this personal feature of the work is typed by the Kohathites' carrying their burden on their shoulders. But in writing books and preparing

lectures, the antitypical Kohathites get help from one another—from one another's oral or written instructions. And, again, they sometimes work together in writing separate parts of the same books, *e.g.,* in writing the articles of Bible Dictionaries and Religious Encyclopedias. Such assistance of, and co-operations with, one another are typed by two or more Kohathites' bearing between them on rods the tabernacle furniture and vessels.

(21) The above study manifests a factual and reasonable interpretation—type and antitype—of Num. 7: 1-9. It adds probative and corroborative force to our previous interpretations of the pertinent parts of Num. 1, 3 and 4. It and they show a harmony and correspondence in the principles of the Scriptures and the facts of Church History such as we should expect to find between types and antitypes. Throughout these studies we have strictly adhered to our Pastor's definitions; and by paralleling as type and antitype these definitions with the facts adduced we have found a complete correspondence between them, such as are characteristic of Jehovah's types and antitypes. Accordingly, we have the assurance of faith that in this the Lord has given us a further development of the Epiphany Truth on the Gospel-Age picture—some more light from the moon, shining now in the night time of trouble (Ps. 121: 6). For this we thank, worship and praise the Father of Lights, from whom cometh down every good gift and every perfect gift.

(22) We now desire to continue the study of this chapter, beginning with v. 10. But we believe that a brief review of our study of Num. 1-6 and 26 will help us better to gain a more connected view of the antitypical setting of the book, and thus better to see how the general features of the Gospel-Age people of God are typed in the general features of Numbers. Therefore we will first give a brief review of our former studies: Num. 1: 1-17 shows us typically the agents that the Lord has used in marking, defining, limiting,

etc., the twelve denominations of Christendom. Then, the marking, defining, limiting, etc., of these denominations are set forth typically in vs. 18-46, while in vs. 47-54 the faith-justified ones in these denominations are typically described as distinct from these denominations in the antitypical camp. Chap. II describes typically the denominations from the standpoints: (1) of their central creedal thought as respects God's attributes: those on the antitypical East centering their creedal thought on God's Power, those on the antitypical South, on His Wisdom, those on the antitypical West, on His Justice, and those on the antitypical North, on His Love; and (2) the time and logical order of their development *in so far as this is compatible with the basal creedal thought of the four groups.* These two chapters thus set forth typically the development of the Nominal Church in twelve denominations as distinct from the Real Church, while Num. 26 shows typically the main subdivisions and sub-subdivisions of these twelve denominations.

(23) Num. 3: 1-4 sets forth typically the Real Church, while Num. 3: 5—4: 49 sets forth typically the Gospel-Age Levites in three groups and eight subdivisions, and their services, as well as the relations of the Priests to these. Thus these four chapters set forth the Real and Nominal Churches during the Gospel-Age in so far as there is a Divine approval of their relations. Num. 5: 1-10 sets forth the three classes of Gospel-Age sinners: the Great Company, the Second Death class and Nominal Christians, while vs. 11-31 show Christ's relation to the Real Church and the Nominal Churches from the standpoint of their relations to symbolic chastity. Thus this chapter brings out certain relations between the Real Church and the Nominal Church further than those indicated in the first four chapters of this book, typically giving the reason for the difference between them. Num. 6: 1-27 sets forth typically the teachers in the Church, more particularly the Apostles and those of the secondarily

prophets who have been used as the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand. Then Num. 7 brings out typically the good services of the crown-lost leaders during the Gospel-Age, as helpful to the Levites (vs. 1-9) and to the Priests (vs. 10-89). All these features bring out in greater detail certain features mentioned in Revelation, especially in chapters 1-3, 7 and 17. Thus Israel's organization, parts and works type corresponding Gospel-Age matters. With this brief review of matters hitherto given in some detail in these columns, we now proceed to discuss further features of Num. 7, beginning with v. 10, remembering that the entire chapter treats typically of the good services of Gospel-Age crown-lost leaders: (1) for the Levites (vs. 1-9), and (2) for the Priests (vs. 10-89).

(24) V. 10: The altar of this verse is the golden altar, because the vessels offered by the princes were of gold and silver, while, if the brazen (copper) altar were meant, the vessels would have been of copper. The expression, "*before the altar*," with which v. 10 ends, should read, "for [*i.e.,* in the interests of] the altar." The Hebrew word *liphne,* here translated *before,* frequently means *for* in the sense of *in the interests of* (Ps. 116: 14), its primary literal meaning being, *for the face of* Our suggested translation is necessary; for the princes did not go into the Holy before the golden altar. The altar, of course, types the Christ as He appears to God and new creatures, in His capacity of comforting, encouraging, correcting and warning the Priesthood while it is sacrificing. The anointing of the golden altar would type the qualifying of the Christ for this work in the requisite abilities and graces. This anointing occurred in the Gospel-Age—"the day"—and in particular respectively after each period of the Gospel-Age in which the Little Flock leaders gave the impulses to the movements that later the crown-lost leaders perverted into sects. Hence in each case it was sometime after each movement was inaugurated, as is implied by its

taking place during the *anointing* of the antitypical Altar; for the Christ gets His anointing gradually through faithfulness in sacrificing and helping fellow sacrificers. Hence in each set of Little Flock representatives so anointed, the completing of the anointing was a considerable time after that part of the Church would initiate the pertinent movement later perverted into a sect by the crown-lost leaders. Thus, for example, after Zwingli, and then later his colaborers, Oecolampadius, Haller, etc., had started the Little Flock movement on the Lord's Supper as a symbolic service, and had by the Word and providence of the Lord received their anointing as the then standing Altar, Bullinger, Calvin, Beza, Knox, etc., offered the antitypical vessels, etc., as the princes (leaders) of antitypical Judah. These antitypical vessels, etc., were presented for the dedication of the antitypical Altar—to support, defend and justify the faithful in their bringing forth and supporting the truth underlying the pertinent movement, showing and proving that they and their service in this respect were dedicated (presented) to God in a proper manner and were accepted by Him as having been properly done. Thus they brought their offering for the benefit of the antitypical Altar.

(25) V. 11 shows typically Jehovah's willingness to accept the offerings of the crown-lost princes of antitypical Israel. This is typically implied in Jehovah's charge to Moses to arrange a separate day for each of the princes to bring the typical offerings, representing how Jehovah charged our Lord as His Executive to arrange for distinct and separate periods for the twelve antitypical princes to make their offerings. These antitypical periods in some cases were far apart, and in other cases were very near one another. In some cases they are not given in the type in the chronological order of the antitype; for the type presents the twelve princes as offering in the order that Num. 2 presents the tribes in their stations about the tabernacle,

so as to bring out *the order of the four Divine attributes in their relation to the four groups or camps in antitypical Israel.* These points will be brought out in the individual cases as we proceed. Thus the order in which the four camps and the tribes in each of them marched (Num. 10: 14-28) being the same as that in which they are enumerated in Num. 2, and in which their princes offered (Num. 7: 12-89), we should search for the underlying reasons for this. There are several reasons for this, some of which we will not discuss until we study Num. 10: 14-28. But the reason that we above gave—the order of the operation of the four Divine attributes from the standpoint of man's perceiving them—will suffice for the purposes of Num. 7: 12-89.

(26) Israel in its organization and tabernacle was to be a picture of God's antitypical purposes. One of such purposes was to reveal Himself operating perfectly in power, wisdom, justice and love, and that in the time order just enumerated, as we note from His works (Rev. 4: 6-11). These attributes were for the Priests symbolized in the uncovered mercy seat, in the two cherubim and partly in the Shekinah light in the Holy of Holies. For the Levites they were symbolized by these covered; and for the Israelites, by the standards of the four camps. While we are not able clearly to prove it from the Bible, the rabbinical claim that the standard of Judah's camp had as its emblem a lion, that of Reuben's camp, an eagle, that of Ephraim's camp, an ox, and that of Dan's camp, a man's face, seems reasonable; for these are the symbols used in Rev. 4 and Ezek. 1 for the four great Divine attributes; and it is certain that the basal creedal thoughts of the four camps of antitypical Israel are these four attributes—one for each camp. Undoubtedly the idea of God's Power is the underlying creedal thought of Calvinism, Campbellism and Adventism, the three denominationalisms on the East of the antitypical Tabernacle. The idea of God's Wisdom

is certainly the underlying creedal thought of Greek, Roman and Anglican Catholicism, the three denominationalisms on the South of the antitypical Tabernacle. The idea of Justice is unquestionably the underlying creedal thought of Lutheranism, Congregationalism and Fanaticism, the three isms on the West of the antitypical Tabernacle. So, too, the idea of Love is unquestionably the underlying creedal thought of the Baptist, Methodist and Unitario-Universalist Churches, the three denominations on the North of the antitypical Tabernacle. And as the creeds are the denominational standards, and as these four denominational groups have each a different one of these attributes underlying its standard, it is quite reasonable to believe that in the typical standards were the symbols of these four attributes, as the rabbis claim. We do not, however, present this thought as absolutely demonstrable from the Bible, but as reasonably inferred from its data, considered from the standpoint of the creedal bases of the four antitypical camps; for we do know it to be a fact that a separate one of the four Divine attributes underlies the creedal thought of each one of the four antitypical camps. The natural man by his environment is first of all struck by the idea of God's Power. This is likely the reason why the princes of the camp standing symbolically for power, are represented as offering, in their threefold tribal order, first. With these preliminary remarks we now proceed to particulars, and will first consider—type and antitype—the vessels and the other offerings of the prince of Judah.

(27) V. 12: Nahshon (enchanter), the son of Amminadab (my people is willful), as the prince of Judah (praise), types the crown-lost leaders who perverted into a sect the Zwinglian movement, which advocated that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper represent Jesus' body and blood, and that eating and drinking these represent faith appropriating Christ's merit for justification, and also the Christians' fellowship with

one another. This doctrine, so far as it went, was true. Its advocacy was started by Zwingli, to whose support Oecolampadius, Haller, Myconius and a large number of other Priests rallied. Henry Bullinger, Zwingli's successor as chief pastor of Zurich, Switzerland, seems to have started the work of perverting this movement into a sect; but he was shortly greatly overshadowed by John Calvin, who was one of the sharpest thinkers of all times, and who is generally recognized as "the theologian of the Reformation." Next to Calvin stood Theodore Beza, Calvin's chief colaborer, his chief lieutenant and his successor; and next to him stood John Knox, Scotland's Reformer. There were, of course, many lesser lights than these, like the two Spanheims, Chanier, etc.

(28) The mental acuteness of the chief Calvinistic theologians is generally recognized as at least equal to that of any other set of denominational theologians. This is implied in the name Nahshon, *enchanter;* for by their subtile teaching they have enchanted many. The Hebrew word from which Nahshon is derived means serpent—that which charms—and power to charm—symbolizing subtility; and the *stubbornness* (Amminadab) of the Calvinistic theologians is proverbial. Thus these theologians are in the type properly characterized by the meaning of the names, Nahshon and Amminadab. On the European continent the Calvinistic Churches are usually called Reformed, like the Dutch Reformed, the German Reformed, etc.; and in the British Empire and in America they are usually called Presbyterian. These, as previously shown, are antitypical Judah (*praise*), a name that properly applies to this denomination from its intellectual, moral and religious qualities and works. The ground principle of their theological system is Power, which they imply in their shibboleth, "Divine Sovereignty." Antitypical Judah, being historically and from about every other standpoint the first of the three tribes on the East of the antitypical Tabernacle, occupies

the first place in that camp; and, therefore, its crown-lost leaders are represented as bringing the sacrifice on the first antitypical day, as the first of all.

(29) V. 13: According to this verse Nahshon brought three vessels for the altar—a silver charger or platter, a silver bowl and a golden spoon. Each of the other princes brought the same kinds of vessels, as they also all brought the same three kinds of sacrifices, each kind consisting of the same numbers and kinds of beasts. In fact, the words describing the service of all these princes are identical, excepting, of course, their names, the names of their fathers and the names of their tribes. We have seen that chargers type corrective teachings, bowls, refutative teachings, and spoons, ethical teachings (Chap. II). We will find added confirmations of these thoughts in vs. 13 and 14. It will be noted that there was no offering of cups for the altar by any of the princes. This is exactly in harmony with the antitype, because it was the crown-retaining leaders—antitypical Jacob—who gave the doctrinal teachings that started each Little Flock movement later perverted into a sect by the crown-lost leaders. There is another reason in the antitype for this typical omission: the crown-lost leaders in all cases perverted some doctrinal feature in the teachings given by the Little Flock crown-retaining leaders. *e.g.,* Calvin perverted in a large measure Zwingli's teaching on the purpose of the Lord's Supper; for Calvin's teaching on this feature of the subject leaned toward Luther's doctrine of the real presence. Though he held against Luther with Zwingli on the symbolic view of the bread and wine, and their eating and drinking, yet he claimed that Christ's body and blood were received in the Lord's Supper, not by Christ's being on earth, as Luther taught, but by the communicant's faith ascending to heaven, and there partaking of a mystic power emanating from Christ's body; and, though Calvin held to the thought that the bread and wine symbolized Christ's body and blood, he did not

hesitate to call Zwingli's view on the purpose of the Lord's Supper, as merely symbolic and commemorative, "a profane opinion." In this perversion the other crown-lost leaders like Bullinger, Beza, Knox, etc., agreed with Calvin. It is because of such doctrinal perversions that cups, the types of doctrinal truths, were not offered in the type. Thus the Scriptures are frequently significant in their silence, as they always are in their speech. Later on a reaction set in, leading, in the Presbyterian Church, to a general acceptance of Zwingli's view on the purpose of the Lord's Supper as against Calvin's view.

(30) Remembering that the vessels were offered by the princes for the golden altar, and that this was to type some service that the crown-lost leaders were to perform for the faithful sacrificers in their ministry, and remembering that chargers represent corrective teachings, bowls refutative teachings and spoons ethical teachings, we will readily see that Nahshon's bringing these three vessels for the altar types the services that the Calvinistic crown-lost theologians contributed to the Little Flock servants in Scripturally defending the thought that the bread and wine and their eating and drinking were symbolic. Let us see first how this was done in the case of the antitypical charger, which, as stated above, is corrective teachings, *i.e.,* as to wrong conduct. Since Zwingli, etc., taught that partaking of the bread and wine symbolized faith appropriating Christ's righteousness, and also the fellowship of Christians with one another, though they did not see that this fellowship was a joint participation in the Sin-offering; in bringing the antitypical charger, the Calvinistic crown-lost theologians had to show: (1) that such a doctrine implied setting aside sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in all their forms; for to symbolize such things implies the symbolizers' hostility of heart to sin, error, selfishness and worldliness. Again, (2) that this symbolic understanding of the Lord's Supper required the purging of evil from the

heart (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8), as indicated by its type, which had to be celebrated with *unleavened* bread, after all leaven was removed from the Israelites' homes and burned. Further, (3) they showed it by proving that such symbolization required the heart's reformation to give the feast its sacred setting as distinct from an ordinary meal. Also, in line with this was the thought (4) of the supper being a commemorative feast, and (5) of its requirement of self-examination; (6) the stress that they laid on the warning not to eat and drink unworthily, and the proof which they gave that such unworthy participation made one guilty of the body and blood (sin against them), and (7) the rehearsal of the evils of spiritual weakness, sickness and sleep as a result of unworthy participation in the symbolic feast—one and all proved to be teachings corrective of misconduct. On these particulars they stressed 1 Cor. 11: 26-34, as the Biblical basis for their teaching that the symbolic partaking of the bread and wine implied and enforced reformation of conduct. Thus they offered the antitypical charger.

(31) The bowl of antitypical Nahshon was the refutative teachings 'that the Calvinistic crown-lost leaders used against attacks made on the teaching that the bread and wine represent Christ's body and blood, and' that partaking of them represents the Christians' partaking of Christ's merit and also their fellowshipping with one another. Against this teaching the Catholics by transubstantiation and the Lutherans by instrumentalization, both holding that the actual body and blood were eaten by the mouth of all communicants, contended with the greatest subtility. But antitypical Nahshon was able to refute every argument that transubstantiationists and instrumentalizationists offered. Some of the refutative arguments that we used against these two wrong views of the nature of the Lord's Supper in P 22, 52-56 are identical with those that antitypical Nahshon used; though not having the full light on the Lord's Supper, antitypical Nahshon could

not use all of them, nor in some cases could he put them so clearly. We suggest a re-reading of the article just cited, as illustrative of some of the refutative arguments that antitypical Nahshon used, as well as helpful to a proper appreciation of the Lord's Supper. Some of this class made most crushing refutations of the Catholic and Lutheran views as against the symbolic understanding of the Lord's Supper. *e.g.,* Beza more than worsted the Cardinal of Lorraine in a great debate on the Lord's Supper, before the French royalty and aristocracy in 1561 at Poissy. Similar results attended his debate on the same subject with the ablest Lutheran theologians at Montbeliard, 1586. The controversial writings of antitypical Nahshon on the Lord's Supper are a triumphant overthrowal of objections to the symbolic character of the Lord's Supper offered by Catholics and Lutherans. Thus antitypical Nahshon offered his bowl.

(32) The spoon that Nahshon offered types his antitype's instructions in righteousness that flow from the symbolic understanding of the bread and wine and their eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper. Catholic and Lutheran theologians respectively claimed that such a view would not develop the communicants in righteousness as would the view of transubstantiation and instrumentalization. Refutatively, antitypical Nahshon showed that transubstantiation and instrumentalization fostered superstition, priestcraft and perversion of good qualities, and then positively showed that the commemorative and symbolic view of the Lord's Supper deepens love for God, who gave His Son to death for the lost race, and for Christ, who died for the world, and for all fellow participants, because it symbolizes Christ's death, their appropriating His merit and their fellowship with one another; deepens, increases and elevates faith in justifying and sanctifying aspects; fosters hope in the glorious consummation for the entire family of God in suggesting the new wine; strengthens obedience by the act of

complying with the exhortations germane to the Lord's Supper; strengthens humility by solemnly refreshing heart and mind on the grace of God underlying the service; and stimulates zeal and self-sacrifice by holding God's and Christ's sacrifices before our mind for devout commemoration and symbolization. In these and many other ways they showed how the commemorative and symbolic understanding of the Lord's Supper promoted proper characteristics and conduct. Thus antitypical Nahshon brought the golden spoon.

(33) V. 13 and corresponding verses in this chapter show that the chargers and bowls were silver; and v. 14 and corresponding verses in this chapter show that the spoons of all the princes were gold. As we have long since learned, in Biblical symbols silver represents truth, and gold represents that which is Divine. The thought with reference to the charger and the bowl is, therefore, that *truth* characterized the corrections of wrong qualities and conduct and the refutations of errors, made by the teachings of antitypical Nahshon in his views on the Lord's Supper; while the thought with reference to the golden spoon is that antitypical Nahshon's ethical teachings derived from the Lord's Supper were *Divine* in that they came from God; in that they inured to developing a Divine character; in that they tended to glory, honor and immortality; and in that they enhanced the Divine glory. The weight of these three vessels—the charger 130, the bowl 70, and the spoon 10 shekels of the sanctuary—totaled 210 shekels. It will be noted that each vessel's weight in shekels was in the denomination of ten or its multiples—130, 70, 10. This symbolizes the fact that they were the offerings of those who would ultimately be of a nature lower than the Divine, ten and its multiples symbolizing natures lower than the Divine. But their sum, 210, being a multiple of both 7 and 10, suggests the thought that though their offerers will ultimately be of a nature lower than the Divine, they once were

begotten to the Divine nature as new creatures, having had crowns assigned to them. The weight of the spoon—10 shekels—suggests typically the reckonedly perfect human powers of its offerer; the weight of the bowl 70 shekels, the product of 7 and 10—suggests typically that Divine New Creatures in reckonedly perfect human bodies were its offerers; and the weight of the charger—130 shekels, 130 being the sum of 70 and 60, the latter a multiple of 6, the symbol of evil and imperfection, and of 10 the symbol here of human nature, 60 thus representing corrupt human nature, typically represents that it would be double minded (Jas. 1: 8), Spirit-begotten persons who would offer the antitypical charger. Thus embedded in the weights of these vessels are typical allusions to various outstanding features of the Great Company. Thus in another way than that of their sharing in the sin offering, does the Lord show us that Nahshon and the other princes type crown-lost leaders. The *silver* charger and the bowl *in contrast* with the *golden* spoon seems also to represent the thought that the value of the corrective and refutative teachings was inferior to that of the ethical teachings for Divine purposes.

(34) We are further told that the charger and bowl were full of fine flour mingled with oil for a meat offering (v. 13). As elsewhere shown, the meat (meal) offering represents praise—the proclamation of Jehovah's plan as reflecting credit upon Him by displaying His glorious power, wisdom, justice and love—and worship—service of His plan. Thus the meat offering of Nahshon in the charger and bowl types the fact that by antitypical Nahshon's corrective and refutative teachings, oral and written, there would be credit reflected upon God through their serving Him in furthering their pertinent feature of the Plan—the Lord's Supper. The fine flour represents the minuteness of antitypical Nahshon's teachings; and the oil represents that it was the offering of New Creatures

who put at least a measure of the Lord's Spirit into the service. We are told that the golden spoon was filled with incense. This incense represents the choice human powers of antitypical Nahshon, which were reckoned perfect by Jesus' merit, and which were used in their service of vindicating the symbolic understanding of the Lord's Supper as promotive of godliness, and in that use developed into Divinely pleasing graces; for from God's viewpoint, that crown-lost New Creatures up to 1917 were in antitypical Aaron, it is manifest that their sacrificing in Spirit and in Truth was 'acceptable to Jehovah in Christ, and produced in them some degree of the graces, even as they taught on the graces and the conduct harmonious with them. The fact that Nahshon brought these vessels for the golden altar proves that his antitype must have been New Creatures ministering new-creaturely matters; but his not being a priest proves his antitype to have consisted of crown-losers—another proof that the princes type crown-losers, the fact that the vessels were not copper, but were silver and gold also proving the same thing.

(35) Vs. 15-17 show the animal sacrifices in three forms: the burnt offering, the sin offering and the peace offering. As our dear Pastor has shown us, the burnt offering represents the manifested acceptance of the sacrifice to Jehovah; the sin offering, the atoning character of the sacrifice; and the peace offering, the covenant obligations which were assumed, and which were fulfilled by the sacrifice. We understand the young bullock in the burnt offering to type our Lord as the one whose merit makes the sacrifice acceptable; the ram to type the Church as the one whose sacrifice includes that of the crown-losers before 1917, and thus is instrumental in making the crown-losers' sacrifice available as a part of its own; and the lamb to type the crown-losers as being acceptable to Jehovah through Christ's merit and their inclusion in the

Church. Above we explained the antitypical significance of the kid of the goats for a sin offering (v. 16). V. 17 names a number of the beasts sacrificed in the peace offering. We understand the antitype to be: Through Christ's merit (the two oxen) and on account of their inclusion in the Church (the five rams) as a part of the Sin-offering (the five he goats), the sacrifices of the crown-losers are a fulfillment of their consecration vows (the five lambs). The fact that the lamb in the burnt offering and in the peace offering was of one year in each case, types the maturity of the crown-losers for the sacrificial work that they performed. We have already used the fact of the princes bringing the sin offering as proving that certain Gospel-Age sacrificers, and hence crown-lost New Creatures, are typed by them. The same thought flows from the fact that they bring a burnt offering; for the only sacrifice acceptable to Jehovah, and made during the Gospel-Age, is that of the Christ. So, too, the same conclusion follows from the fact that they brought the peace offering; for the only sacrificial covenant made and fulfilled during the Gospel-Age is that of the Christ. The same thought flows from the fact that a special animal in the burnt and peace offerings types them as distinct from Jesus and the Church. Thus we have found seven arguments which prove that the princes represent the crown-lost sectarian leaders in the Gospel-Age picture: (1) they offered a sin offering; (2) they offered vessels whose shekel weight was of ten or its multiples, and whose total shekel weight was 210 shekels, and whose separate weights and combinations typed reckonedly perfect human beings, Spirit-begotten human beings and double minded new creatures; (3) they offered gold and silver vessels: (4) these vessels belonged to the golden altar; (5) they brought a burnt offering; (6) they brought a peace offering; and (7) they are typed in the burnt and peace offerings by an animal separate from the animals that type Jesus and the Church.

(36) So far in this chapter we studied Num. 7: 1-18, type and antitype, where we entered into details on the chargers, bowls, spoons, their contents and the various animal sacrifices, brought to our attention in vs. 12-17, and connected with Nahshon's offerings. In considering the offerings of the other eleven princes it will not be necessary to enter into their general details, because in the type they are expressed in exactly the same language, and because they are, generally speaking, the same in the antitypical offerings. The difference in the antitype consists in the difference between the twelve doctrines on which the antitypical princes respectively made presentations. Each one of these presented corrections (chargers), refutations (bowls) and instructions in righteousness (spoons), differing from those of the other eleven, inasmuch as the pertinent general truth presented by each one of the antitypical princes was on a different subject. For this reason we will, in discussing the offerings of the other eleven princes, omit the general details on the chargers, bowls, spoons and various animal sacrifices, referring our readers to the previous discussion for these.

(37) V. 18: It will be noted that each of the typical princes offered on a different day. These days anti-typically are successive in time order only among the three antitypical tribes of which each of the four groups consist, except in the case of antitypical Naphtali, and this perhaps because the Universalists were developed after the Methodists. If we should attempt to make them follow one another in time succession, in all twelve antitypical tribes, we would soon come into irreconcilable difficulty. *E.g.*, Nahshon, who offered on the first day, as we have already seen, types the crown-lost leaders of the Presbyterian Church, while Elizur (v. 30) types the crown-lost leaders of the Greek Catholic Church. Antitypical Nahshon began to offer about 1535 A.D., while antitypical Elizur began to offer before 250 A.D., despite the fact that the type makes Nahshon and Elizur offer on the first and fourth days respectively. Again, Nethaniel (v. 18) and

Eliab (v. 24) type the crown-lost leaders of the Christian and Second Advent Churches respectively, while Shelumiel (v. 36) and Eliasaph (v. 42) type the crown-lost leaders of the Roman Catholic and the Episcopal Churches respectively. Antitypical Nethaniel and Eliab began to offer about 1815 and 1850 respectively, while antitypical Shelumiel and Eliasaph began to offer about 250 and 1550 respectively. Thus we see that the time order of the offering is given within each antitypical camp, but not as *between* each camp. These remarks must be kept in mind when considering the order of the days in the type and antitype. Antitypical Nahshon, Nethaniel and Eliab beginning to offer about 1535, 1815 and 1850 respectively, we recognize the time order as successive in this antitypical camp; as it will also be seen to be in the other three antitypical camps, except as noted above.

(38) The doctrine that God gave to the denominations which we call the Christian or Disciple Church as its stewardship teaching through the Faithful is this: The Unity of the Lord's people is founded on the Bible as their only creed. This teaching was first announced by Barton W. Stone in 1804 in Kentucky. Just as the Lord began to give through Zwingli the truth on the Lord's Supper, in defense of which antitypical Nahshon offered the corrections, refutations and instructions in righteousness, as on the special truth of the Reformed or Presbyterian Church, typed by the pertinent charger, bowl and spoon; so did He begin to give through Barton W. Stone the special truth on the basis for the unity of God's people, in defense of which antitypical Nethaniel offered the pertinent corrections, refutations and instructions typed by the pertinent charger, bowl and spoon. But just as Zwingli was joined by other priests in presenting the truth on the Lord's Supper, so was Bro. Stone joined by other Priests in presenting the truth of the unity of God's people as being based on the Bible as their only creed.

(39) Most prominent among these was Thomas Campbell, the father of Alexander Campbell, who was the chief figure in antitypical Nethaniel, as Calvin was the chief one of antitypical Nahshon. Thomas Campbell in 1809 began in Western Pennsylvania a movement with the same teaching as that presented five years before by Barton W. Stone. But for years each labored in ignorance of what the other did and taught, and only later did they find out that the Lord's Spirit led them into the same truth. Each protested by pen and mouth against sectarianism; each began as Presbyterians, but soon repudiated its sectarianism and doctrine of absolute predestination. Each stood out for a Biblical union of all Christians free from all the elements of sectarianism; each became immersionists; and each labored long and successfully as non-sectarianists.

(40) It was Alexander Campbell who turned this Little Flock movement into a sect, called the Christian or Disciple Church. As Calvin corrupted the Zwinglian movement, so Alexander Campbell corrupted in many ways the Stone-Campbell movement. He introduced immersion for the forgiveness of sins—the baptism of John—and the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, just as Calvin introduced the doctrines of absolute predestination and of Presbyterianism into the Zwinglian movement. Thus Alexander Campbell stands out as the chief one of the crown-lost leaders typed by Nethaniel (gift of God) the son of Zuar (little). There were others who were in antitypical Nethaniel, *e.g.*, Samuel Rogers, John Smith, Thomas Allen, Walter Scott and Isaac Errett. These were ever ready to advocate the doctrine that God's people are one and should unite on the Bible alone as their creed. They were ever ready to enter formal debates in defense of this proposition. Alexander Campbell was one of the ablest religious debaters and orators of the nineteenth century. He never came out of a debate second best. His chief debates were with Mr. Owen,

a skeptic, on the evidences of Christianity, with Bishop Purcell, a Roman Catholic, on the Roman Catholic religion, and with Rev. Rice, a Presbyterian, on Baptism and Church Unity. After his example, Christian or Disciple preachers court the opportunity of entering a debate, especially on Christian unity, and always win the debates on this question.

(41) Keeping in mind that the special truth that the Lord committed to the denomination called the Christian or Disciple Church is the unity of God's people as being based on the Scriptures as their only creed, we will be in a position to understand how the crown-lost leaders of that Church—antitypical Nethaniel—presented their antitypical charger (corrections), bowl (refutations) and spoon (instructions in righteousness). Their being called typically *Nethaniel*—gift of God—seems to imply that they offer peace to divided Christendom as a gift from God. Their being typically called Zuar (little) seems to refer to the fact that their demands for unity among God's people are not based on large, but on little conditions—the acceptance of Jesus as Savior and obedience to Him as Lord, and the acceptance of the Bible as the only creed. Contrasted with the exacting demands that, for example, the Papacy makes as conditions of union among God's people, these are little—Zuar—indeed.

(42) The antitypical charger (corrections) that they brought corrected misconduct against true unity among God's people. It showed what were the evils of sectarianism, and how they could be put aside by true unity among God's people. It showed that sectarianism divided God's people, made them hostile, envious, partisan, mean, despicable, selfishly ambitious, only partially fruitful in goodness, servile to leaders and denomination and objects of hostile attacks from outsiders. These evils it showed could all be corrected by unity among God's people. It further showed that human creeds are the product of much ignorance, superstition and perversion, that they lead to strife,

vain-glory, error, division, partisanship, disfellowshipment of true brethren, shutting out of advancing light and settling in the bog of reactionism. These evils it pointed out would all be set aside by adopting the Bible as the only creed, in trust that the Lord by His Spirit would open up its mysteries as they would become due to those walking in the advancing light. In these and other ways antitypical Nethaniel offered his charger, and we are sure that God at Jesus' hands accepted this charger.

(43) So did the crown-lost leaders of the Christian or Disciple Church also offer the antitypical bowl—refutative teachings. Their position on the unity of God's people as being based upon their acceptance of the Scriptures as their only creed, was contrary to the creedal views of all other denominations. It additionally antagonized the views of the Greek and Roman Catholics on tradition as a source of rule and faith. It antagonized the creed views and practices of all the f denominations; for almost all of them had written creeds, confessions and disciplines. These, therefore, attacked the Christian or Disciple view. In turn the crown-lost leaders of this denomination attacked the arguments used in defense of creeds, showing that they are nothing less than corporational rules and regulations and human chains binding their accepters to spiritual slavery, stunting their growth and cutting them off from all advancing truth contradictory to their creeds. Additionally they pointed out the fact that all of them taught error and separated in hostile camps God's dear children, who should be united in head and heart in the oneness of the Divine family. In defense of their own position they argued that their creed was the Divinely revealed one, inerrant, sufficient, perfect and practical. It excludes those only whom God excludes; and it includes all whom God includes. It gives liberty to each in non-essentials, and makes none the dictators and lords over other's faith. It allows for differences in degrees of knowledge

in all. These crown-lost leaders used as their shibboleth the saying, "Where the Scriptures speak we speak; where the Scriptures are silent we are silent." Certainly this is a safe course, and the only one capable of making for union among God's people. The strength of this position lies in its Scripturalness; and this accounts for the Christian or Disciple controvertialists coming out of their frequent debates as victors.

(44) Antitypical Nethaniel also brought as his offering the golden spoon—the instructions in righteousness flowing from the Scriptural teaching that the union of God's people is based upon the Bible as their only creed. They pointed out that the union of God's people was necessary to yield God the most glory, inasmuch as it showed that a united people was an honor to their God, and that a united family was an honor to their Father. They showed how this would honor and please the Savior, one of whose last prayers was for the unity of God's people. It was especially along the lines of the graces operative in the Christian brotherhood that they made telling points along the lines of instructions in righteousness. They showed how this teaching helped the brethren to love one another with increasing fervency. They pointed out that it conduced to long-suffering and patience in connection with non-essential differences. They emphasized how it made one tolerant where tolerance was a virtue, and unbending where firmness was required. They proved that it was a strong support to gentleness, humility, meekness, consideration and politeness; and above all they affirmed that this position enabled each and all to be real brethren in the Lord and to act as such, inasmuch as they could view one another as New Creatures and ignore fleshly differences. In these ways antitypical Nethaniel offered the golden spoon.

(45) We will not here enter into a discussion of the fine flour mingled with oil, contained in the charger and the bowl, nor into a discussion of the sweet incense

in the spoon, since their significance is the same in all twelve cases, and is therefore here the same as in the case of that presented by Nahshon, as explained above, to which we refer our readers for these particulars. For the same reason we will not enter into a discussion of the gold and silver metals in the three vessels that Nethaniel brought, nor of their weights, nor of the burnt offering, the sin offering and the peace offering, in themselves and in the various animals of which they consisted. The accommodation to Nethaniel's offerings of the remarks made on these matters in connection with Nahshon's offerings will suffice to make these points clear without repetition here.

(46) In order better to appreciate Eliab's offering, let us recall that he types the crown-lost leaders of the Adventists; for the tribe of Zebulun (habitation) types the Second Adventists, or Adventists as they are called for short. They are antitypical Zebulun (habitation), because, it will be recalled, in Adventism antitypical Elijah and Elisha became the cleansed sanctuary separate from Great Babylon, and the expectation was that the faithful teachers, as antitypical Jacob (Gen. 30: 19, 20) would find a habitation unto the end with the Adventists; for in Adventism they became a sanctuary henceforth separated from Bablyon. Eliab means *God is father—life-giver,* and Helon means *strong.* Their crown-lost leaders as advocates of God as the life-giver who will display His strength in connection with Christ's Second Advent, when believers would be given life by God's strength, are thus indicated by the name of the prince who types them. Thus Adventism as a sect stresses God's power in the resurrection, even as Calvinism stresses it by its shibboleth, the sovereignty of God, in election, and as Campbellism stresses it in the Bible as the power of God to unite God's people in one and unto salvation. Thus we see that the three tribes to the east of the tabernacle, type the three denominations that specially stress power as a Divine attribute in their creeds.

(47) The Advent movement was begun (Jacob begetting Zebulun) by William Miller, who originally was an infidel, but who by the study of the Bible became a believer. About 1818 he began to study prophecy and chronology. By 1829 he had developed his system of prophetic chronology and doctrine quite fully, when he began to converse on it to individuals. But he did not make much of it in the way of witnessing publicly until 1831. His first public lecture on The Second Advent was delivered on the first Sunday in August, 1831. (White's, Life Of Miller, page 80.) Bro. Miller stressed a number of things, especially (1) prophetic chronology, (2) Christ's Second Advent and (3) the saints' Millennial reign with Christ after the Second Advent. To the day of his death (Dec. 20, 1849) he continued to believe in the immortality of man, in his consciousness in death, in eternal bliss entered at death by the righteous and in eternal torment entered at death by the wicked. He first expected the Lord's return, and that visibly in the flesh, sometime between March and October, 1843, and then, this failing, Oct. 22, 1844. After his second disappointment, he humbly and publicly confessed his mistake, but could not point out wherein he had made a mistake in his prophetic periods, which were in the main from March, 1844, properly understood; but he began his 1290 and 1335 years' periods 30 years before his 1260 years' period, which from about March, 1844, on were rightly begun in 539 A. D. Previous to March, 1844, he began them at 538. He began and ended the 2300 days at 457 B. C. and 1843 A. D. respectively. Certainly he did not understand correctly the Lord's Second Advent in its time, object and manner. Yet his chronological periods in the main were correct, though he applied some parts of them incorrectly. His was indeed a movement in God's order, corresponding in the parallel dispensation to the "Israelites indeed" and the Magi before and just after our Lord's birth going forth to meet the Messiah.

(48) What special doctrine did the Lord give through

him in connection with which antitypical Eliab offered his antitypical charger, bowl and spoon, with their appurtenances and attendant sin, meat and peace offerings? The crown-lost leaders of Adventism have variously' stressed some doctrines. Most of them have stressed man's mortality, the unconsciousness of the dead and the destruction of the wicked. These could not have been the doctrines in connection with which antitypical Eliab offered the antitypical charger, bowl and spoon, because Bro. Miller—the part of antitypical Jacob who started the movement that was turned by the crown-lost leaders of Adventism into a sect—disbelieved them, therefore could not have used them to beget the Advent movement. Nor could Christ's pre-Millennial advent have been that doctrine, because the Baptists centuries before Miller made that a point of their faith. Nor was it Seventh-Dayism, which a majority of Adventists now accept, for Bro, Miller never taught it, nor did any of his followers until after 1846. Of the three things that he specially stressed there is only one which no previous movement specially stressed, and which the crown-lost Adventist leaders did stress, *i.e.,* the prophetic chronology. So prophetic chronology is the thing by which Bro. Miller began his movement—Jacob begetting. Zebulun. And the facts undeniably prove this. Prophetic time was the special point that he emphasized, that drew many to his movement, and that was the main target of his opponents' arrows. Thus the facts show what was the Biblical teaching committed to the Adventists as their special stewardship doctrine, in connection with which, accordingly, antitypical Eliab offered the antitypical charger, bowl and spoon—prophetic time.

(49) A wrong chronology prevalent in Miller's day moved him to start the 490 and 2300 days at Ezra's commission, given in this wrong chronology as 457 B. C. Hence he made it end in 1843. This date (1843) moved him first to start his 1260 and 1290 days with 538 A. D., and then from March, 1844, onward with

539 A. D., which was correct. But trying to make the periods end in 1843 (later in 1844), he made the 1335 days begin 30 years earlier than they should have been made to begin. The Lord gave him in a general way to see about correctly in his time periods, except that of the 1335 days. This was not due to be seen more clearly at that time. And instead of censuring him for inexactness, we are warranted in admiring the general correctness of his time prophetic views. He was undoubtedly a Divinely used and approved vessel for the Truth due in his time, and his evident humility in view of his mistake, and his unabated zeal in proclaiming after 1844 the nearness of the Lord's return, show him to have been a genuine member of antitypical Jacob and Elijah. The fact that he did not see clearly all the details of the doctrine that he used in starting the movement that was later perverted into Adventism is no more against him than the parallel facts that all other non-apostolic brethren of antitypical Jacob as beginners of Little Flock movements that were later perverted into denominations failed to see all the details of the respective doctrines that they used to begin their respective movements, *e.g.,* Luther did not see the distinction between tentative and vitalized justification; Zwingli failed to see that the bread and wine also represent the Church's life-rights and right to life, etc., etc. Surely the path of the just has been as a shining light, shining more and more unto the perfect day.

(50) Having seen what the doctrine is that God entrusted to the Adventists as their special stewardship teaching—time prophecy connected with the Second Advent, let us look at the prince of antitypical Zebulun and his offerings a little more closely. Adventism divided into about a half-dozen sects, all of which have held more or less firmly to Bro. Miller's time prophetic views, though perforce admitting his mistake. Moreover, Little Flock brethren, vacillating as to 1843 and 1844, about 1859 forecast 1873 and, that failing, 1874 as the time of our Lord's return, basing their views on

those of Bro. Miller, except that they started the 1335 days at the same point as the 1260 and the 1290 days, first at 538, then 539 A. D. Usually those who continued after 1874 to expect Christ to come visibly in the flesh have, while holding to the time periods, deprecated fixing the date of that event. The main crown-lost leaders—antitypical Eliab—who have held the time setting of Bro. Miller are Joshua Hines, Bro. Miller's ablest personal helper for years before the latter's death, James and Ellen White, Uriah Smith and Miles Grant. These, then, are the most important members of antitypical Eliab. The use that they have made since 1874 of Bro. Miller's time prophecy is not to fix the date of the Lord's return, but to stress its imminence, since they say that the time periods have run their full course and that we are now in the waiting time, of whose duration they concede their ignorance.

(51) Like all other crown-lost leaders, they offered a charger, a bowl and a spoon, *i.e.,* corrective, refutative and ethical teachings. As the doctrine in connection with which they offer these teachings is time prophecy, we are to look for them to show that time prophecy connected with the hope of our Lord's return corrects wrong conduct and qualities, refutes attacks upon the general time prophetic setting of things given by Bro. Miller, and helps toward right living. Thus their antitypical charger was their precepts, exhortations, etc., connected with time prophetic teachings that corrected wrong living. "That blessed hope" of our Lord's return, kept in mind, has always helped to godliness, while its being forgotten has always been conducive to worldliness. When the great apostacy at the beginning of the Age set aside the hope of the Church in our Lord's return as the time of the Church's union and reign with Him over the earth, for the hope of converting the world and reigning over it a thousand years before our Lord's return, it paved the way for a flood of worldliness to spread over the Church. That perverted hope made its advocates lower the standard of

real consecration, which during the reign of sin and selfishness has found only a comparatively few responsive souls, and resort to methods and teachings that would appeal to the world. Hence arose many false doctrines, a hierarchial organization, an elaborate and gorgeous ritual and an easy life adapted to win the unregenerated. Stress was laid on external rites, acts and rewards that appealed to the world. Multitudes found the Church the surest and quickest door to popularity, wealth, position, promotion and power. Whence arose a selfish, worldly, erroneous and sinful set of qualities and practices in the Church. Worldly ambition, numbers, power, popularity, prestige, wealth and position, with their concomitants of pride, self-exaltation, strife, envy, hatred, malice, revenge, etc., everywhere took the place of the world-denying, self-renouncing, self-sacrificing and Spirit-filled life of the early disciples.

(52) Such an un-Christian spirit has always marked the life of the bulk of those who have given up "that blessed hope," while wherever "that blessed hope" sets aside the perverted hope of the Church reigning without her Lord and before His return, these evils are set aside. Who will continue trying to convert the multitude by lowering the Christian standard to their level, if he believes that the present time is set aside, not for the conversion of the world, but for the selection of the Church with an incidental testimony of the coming kingdom to the world? Who, realizing that it is his great task to follow in Jesus' steps in preparing himself for his real work in the Millennium, will make worldly popularity, wealth, position, honor, influence, etc.' the objects of his ambition? Will he not see that these are in the way of his overcoming, and that he that hath his hope in him purifieth himself of these and all other evils even as Christ is pure? Will not the desire to be an overcomer enable him to put aside the spirit of anger, pride, self-exaltation, malice, envy, strife, hatred, revenge, etc., engendered by conditions created by

the false hope? Yea, verily! And this is exactly the use that antitypical Eliab has made of the hope of our Lord's return as imminent, derived from Bro. Miller's teaching on time prophecy connected with our Lord's return. And who will say that this corrective use of this teaching has not been effective in enabling its faithful accepters to cleanse themselves from the evils that Post-Millennialism has brought in its wake? If we look at the life of faithful Adventists, we see much that reminds us of the primitive Church in its world-renouncing spirit, and this is undoubtedly due to the stress that antitypical Eliab has laid on the cleansing influence of the imminence of that blessed hope. And in stressing the cleansing power of the thought of the Second Advent's nearness, and that in various details and in a right spirit, antitypical Eliab has offered his antitypical charger filled with antitypical fine flour mingled with antitypical oil.

(53) Likewise, these crown-lost leaders of the Adventists have offered the antitypical bowl—refutations of attacks on the time prophetic periods as given by Bro. Miller. The Miller movement attracted an immense amount of attention in its day, and many and able were its oral and literary opponents. Among Bro. Miller's opponents were Profs. Stowe, Pond, Bush, Stuart and Chase, and Drs. Dowling, Jarvis, Hinton, Hamilton, Shimeal and Kendrick. Differing in their views, these sought variously to refute his views of the time prophecies connected with the Second Advent. Some of them denied that the 2300, the 1260, the 1290 and the 1335 days represented years. Antitypical Eliab refuted them especially by the 70 weeks, or 490 days, until the completion of exclusive favor on Israel, and by proving that the Hebrew word *chatach,* translated "determined" in Dan. 9: 24, means "cut off," *i.e.,* from the 2300 days. Some of them claimed that Daniel's fourth kingdom (Dan. 7 and 8) meant the divided Grecian Empire. That antitypical Eliab refuted by showing that most of the facts prophesied in Dan. 7

and 8 of the fourth kingdom could not be found fulfilled in the divided Grecian Empire, but were all found in the Roman Empire and its divisions. Some of his opponents applied the "little horn" to Antiochus Epiphanes, others to the Mohammedan power. Antitypical Eliab disproved these views, proving that it referred to the papacy. Some of his opponents dated the 1260 and the 1290 days as being so many literal days in the history of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the corresponding 1260 days in Revelation as applying to as many literal days in the history of Nero; others of them refused to fix a time for their beginning, for which others took 606 A. D., the date of Phocus' decree. On this point antitypical Eliab was nearest the truth in defending 538 A. D., when in endeavoring to make effective Justinian's decree Belisarius, his general, forced the Ostrogoths to abandon the siege of Rome. But 539 A. D. is the right date, when Belisarius destroyed the Ostrogothic kingdom, and thus fieed the pope from being cramped by them, leaving him liberty to set up his own power in Italy. On the date of Christ's advent Bro. Miller, of course, was wrong, and antitypical Eliab has had to admit this, and has been unable to give a satisfactory explanation of the 1844 date. On the pre-Millennial advent of our Lord many of his opponents fought him in the interests of Post-Millennialism; but antitypical Eliab has ably shown their error and proved the scripturalness of Pre-Millennialism. Thus successful in controversy against the opponents of the Truth that Bro. Miller gave in the Miller movement has antitypical Eliab been—he offered the antitypical bowl filled antitypically with its oil mingled with fine flour.

(54) Antitypical Eliab also offered his spoon filled with sweet incense. This spoon represents the instructions in righteousness, the ethical teachings, that the crown-lost leaders of the Adventists presented in connection with the time prophecies associated with our Lord's return as given by Bro. Miller. As the doctrine of the speedy return of the Lord tended to purify its

accepters from sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, so it also tended to develop its believers in the graces of the Spirit. On this account antitypical Eliab held it out as the blessed hope whose realization meant the deliverance and glorification of the Church and her eternal association with the Lord and with one another. This, of course, stimulated hope. They stressed the necessity of love to God, the Lord Jesus, the brethren, the world of mankind, including enemies, as indispensable for fitness to share in the realization of that hope; and, of course, this tended to develop love in the Faithful. They stressed the necessity of keeping this hope in the heart as a means of enabling the brethren to exercise patience amid the obstacles to godliness; and this helped to develop patience in the responsive. They held up this hope before the brethren to enable them to cultivate heavenly-mindedness. By stressing the littleness of our present suffering, self-denials and sacrifices in comparison with "the glory that shall be revealed," antitypical Eliab gave teachings that assisted the brethren to exercise the spirit of obedience. By contrasting the hope with our littleness they gave teachings tending to humility. In stressing the thought of Jesus' coming as King and Lord they gave teachings calculated to produce meekness. By contrasting the vanity of present earthly things with the substantiality of the present privileges of service and the prospects of glory they gave teachings conducive to developing zeal. Thus the message of the Second Advent's imminence as antitypical Eliab stressed its various phases, became in his hands a means of instruction in righteousness—ethical teachings—of first class importance. Much antitypical sweet incense was in this antitypical spoon, and it was surely offered by antitypical Eliab.

(1) What characteristic has Num. 7? What does it necessitate in our article on it? What do the twelve princes represent generally and particularly? What fact repeatedly stated in the chapter proves the precise definition of

the antitype? What two conclusions result from that fact and their not being priests?

(2) How can we explain the fact of the antitypical princes being crown-losers and yet sharing in the Sin-offering? Under what circumstances only are such distinguished from the antitypical Aaron? What thought, from the Gospel-Age picture, is proven correct by the princes' bringing the sin offering? Why? Until when were crown-losers parts of antitypical Aaron? What then began to take place? In connection with what work? What four conclusions result from these considerations? Briefly give a precise definition of the twelve antitypical princes.

(3) Give several illustrations—type and antitype—of this line of thought. Explain, the episode of the trouble between Abraham and Lot and their herdsmen, type and antitype, in line with this thought. Also that between Isaac's and the Philistines' herdsmen as to the wells, in line with this thought. Give some examples from Church History elucidating the antitype. Why do these types distinguish the Faithful from the others? Under what circumstances would types not make the distinction? Give an example of such a type.

(4) What examples are given as illustrations of crown-lost leaders? What did each do with a Little Flock movement? In whom were they typed?' How are we to think of these persons as to their standing?

(5) What have we shown in the preceding part of this chapter? In a general way what is represented by the things offered by the twelve princes? For what do these generalities prepare us? What aspects of the antitypes of Numbers have we not and what aspect of them have we been studying?

(6) What application have we (Vol. V, Chap. Ill) made of Num. 7: 1? What words were stressed to prove the application? What two questions are raised by this application? To what three antitypical periods do the events of Numbers apply? What necessitates these three applications? What proves two of these applications? Why? Why does the Epiphany application raise the second of our two questions?

(7) What must be done to see the harmony here? What are the three distinctions? Explain each of these distinctions. Prove the first one Scripturally.

(8) Explain the second distinction. State and answer an objection to the tentative part of this distinction. Give a parallel case in proof. Does God's foreknowledge force the thing foreknown to happen? What is the relation between His foreknowledge and the foreknown events? Why is it proper to speak of the Church in the Epiphany as set up individually? When will the Church be set up unchangeably and individually? Why?

(9) What does this threefold distinction make possible with the words, "on the *day* that Moses had *fully* set up the tabernacle"? How are these words to be interpreted with reference to the Gospel-Age? When did it begin and end? What had been done on this day before the antitypical princes offered? What is the antitype of anointing the tabernacle, and sanctifying it? How were these two antitypes done? What is the antitype of anointing each instrument and vessel? Sanctifying each instrument and vessel?

(10) What is meant by the altar? What is the antitype of its anointing? Its sanctification? The anointing of its vessels? And their sanctification?

(11) What does the connection between vs. 1 and 2 show? How did the antitype of this occur? What is the antitypical relation of the offering of this chapter to the antitypical numbering of Num. 1? What is typed by the princes' offering? Of what character did this offering not partake? Why not? Of what character did it partake? How could the same class offer to Azazel and to Jehovah? What part of their service is set forth in this chapter?

(12) What does v. 3 describe? What is typed by the fact that they brought their offerings *before the Lord? Before the tabernacle?* What do wagons type? Prove this Scripturally. What, in a general way, are the antitypes of the wagons of Num. 7: 3-8? What is typed by the wagons' being covered? What do draft animals—horses, asses and oxen—type? Prove the answer. What is typed by two princes' bringing one wagon? By each prince's bringing one ox?

(13) Why is the definition of organizations, or even of religious organizations, not precise enough for the antitypical wagons? What are the exact antitypes of the six wagons? Why? What are the exact antitypes of the oxen? Why?

(14) Against what mistake should we be on our guard as respects the antitypical wagons? Why? Give examples proving that six *kinds* of organizations and not six organizations are typed by the six wagons? Against what mistake should we be on our guard as respects the six pairs of oxen? Why? Give examples proving that six kinds of constitutions, or charters, and six kinds of sets of by-laws, are typed by the six pairs of oxen. What would each pair of oxen type?

(15) In understanding the antitype what must we keep in mind? When did not, and since when did, such societies exist? How were their functions performed before they came into existence? How does the finished picture treat the matter? Give some illustrations on this line. What kind of publishers that are not societies are included in the antitype? Give some examples. When did Periodical Societies come into existence without any others before doing their work? Who are included in this antitypical wagon?

(16) What do vs. 4-8 show? What did Jehovah do with the wagons to Moses—type and antitype? What is represented by His charging Moses to give them to the Levites? and that according to their service? To what Levites did this restrict them—type and antitype? Why? How many went to the Gershonites and how many to the Merarites—type and antitype? Why the difference in number?

(17) What two things have the antitypical Gershonites had as their work? What resulted from this as regards the antitypical wagons? Why did they need only two antitypical wagons? Name the respective antitypical wagons. Which went to the Libnites and which to the Shimites? When did these societies have constitutions and when charters? What precisely did the two oxen for each wagon represent? Of what use were these antitypical wagons?

(18) What are the two classes of antitypical Merarites, and what were their respective works? How manifold was their work? How many antitypical wagons became thereby necessary for them? Why was each one necessary? What conditioned the character of the two antitypical oxen for each of these wagons?

(19) What does the word *Ithamar* mean? What antitype is suggested by this meaning? Who constituted the Gospel-Age Ithamar? Who typed the stars of the reaping periods? What is typed by Moses' giving the wagons to

the Levites through Ithamar? Cite examples of God's by antitypical Ithamar doing this.

(20) What did the Kohathites not receive? Why not? What does this type? In what two ways do the antitypical Kohathites serve as implied in the type? Why can they not do their work through antitypical wagons? Of what four classes are they? What is the work of each of these classes? How do they antitypically carry their burden on the shoulder? How is their co-operation typed? In what two ways do they help one another? Cite examples.

(21) What is the character of the interpretation above given? What do these qualities give to our understanding of the Gospel-Age antitypes of Numbers? What do they show? What has been followed in these studies? What has been the primary result? The secondary result? To what should this move us?

(22) What would be profitable at this juncture? Why? What does Num. 1: 1-17 type? Num. 1: 18-46? Num. 1: 47-54? From what two standpoints are the twelve denominations of Christendom typed in Num. 2? Summarize the antitypes of Num. 1, 2 and 26.

(23) What is typically set forth in Num. 3: 1-4? Num. 3: 5-4: 49? In how many groups and subdivisions? Summarize the antitype of Num. 1-4. What does Num. 5: 1-10 type? Num. 5: 11-31? Num. 6: 1-27? Num. 7: 1-9? Num. 7: 10-89? In what other book and chapters is similar ground covered? Summarize the review. What is our next task?

(24) What is the altar of v. 10? Why? Why not the other altar? What is the right translation for the words rendered, "before the altar," in v. 10? Why? In what respect and capacities does this altar type the Christ? What does its anointing type? When did its. antitype occur, from the standpoints of this chapter? How, in point of time and agencies, did the antitypical anointing and offering from the standpoint of this chapter occur? Give an illustrative example. For what were the vessels presented—type and antitype? How were they for the altar—type and antitype?

(25) What does v. 11 show? What does this type? What is typed by a day set aside for each prince to offer? How do these periods of the Gospel-Age compare with one another? In what order is there sometimes a time difference between the time order of type and antitype? In what passages is the typical order given? How do we account for the difference?

(26) Of what is Israel in its organization and tabernacle typical? What is one of Jehovah's purposes? How were His attributes typed for the Priests, Levites and Israelites? What Biblical symbols are used for Jehovah's four chief attributes? What do the rabbis claim for these in relation to the four standards of Israel's four camps? Can this claim be *clearly* demonstrated Scripturally? What is a reasonable proof of it? What is the basal creedal thought for each of the four camps of antitypical Israel? Name the three denominations in each of the four antitypical camps. Prove the basal creedal thought of each of these camps. Of what are the creeds the antitype? Why? What is reasonable to infer from this? What Divine attribute first attracts the natural man's attention? For what is this the probable reason? Whose vessels and offerings,, type and antitype, are given first in this chapter?

(27) What do the names, Nahshon, Amminadab and Judah, mean? Whom does Nahshon type? What was Zwingli's view of the Lord's Supper? How was it related to truth? Who first started it, and who shortly joined in teaching it? Who were the chief perverters of the Zwinglian movement into a sect? Who was the main one among these perverters? Describe two others and mention still three others.

(28) What is the mental quality of Calvinistic theologians? In what is this implied? How so? What is a heart quality of Calvinistic theologians? How is this indicated? What is the continental name of the Calvinistic Churches? the British and American name? Who types them? What does the word *Judah* mean? Explain its antitypical application. What shibboleth of theirs shows the ground principle of their doctrinal system? Why are the Calvinistic Churches given first place in their camp? How does the type show this?

(29) How many and what vessels did Nahshon and the other princes bring for the altar? What other similarity was there in their offering? How do the accounts compare with, and differ from, one another? What do chargers, bowls and spoons type? Where is added confirmatory proof given for these antitypes? What did they not offer that were used in the Holy? What two antitypical reasons account for this omission? Give an example of this. How did Calvin and his followers, while retaining Zwingli's symbolic and commemorative interpretation of the Lord's

Supper, pervert its purpose and effect? What set in later?

(30) What two lines of thought must be kept in mind which will help us to understand the antitype of Nahshon's offering the vessels? What is the antitype? To what do we first apply this thought? What does the charger type? What was Zwingli's view of the Lord's Supper? What did he not see as implied in the fellowship symbol? What did the crown-lost Calvinistic theologians do in offering the antitypical charger? By what seven teachings did they do this?

(31) What did Nahshon's bowl represent? What Churches especially attacked antitypical Nahshon's teaching on the Lord's Supper? By what two doctrines? What did antitypical Nahshon do with these attacks? Where are some of these arguments given? Compare The Present Truth's statement on the subject with antitypical Nahshon's. What did some of this class do with Catholic and Lutheran attacks? Cite the cases in Beza's experiences.

(32) What does Nahshon's spoon type? What did Catholics and Lutherans claim as to the ethical effects of antitypical Nahshon's teaching on the Lord's Supper? In what two ways did he meet their claim? How did its teachings tend to develop love, faith, hope, obedience, humility, zeal and self-sacrifice? What did this, so doing, effect?

(33) Of what materials were the chargers, bowls and spoons of all the princes made? What do silver and gold symbolize? What does this imply as to the antitypical chargers, bowls and spoons? What does this imply as to antitypical Nahshon's charger, bowl and spoon? What was the weight of each charger, bowl and spoon? What is the total of the weight of each charger, bowl and spoon? What thoughts are typed by the weight of each vessel and the three vessels? Why? What is typed by the fact that their total weight is a multiple of both seven and ten? What is typed by the weight of each vessel? What is the antitype in the contrast between silver and gold vessels?

(34) Of what were the charger and bowl full? For what was this offered? What is typed by this? What does this imply as to antitypical Nahshon's meat offering? What does the fineness of the flour represent? What does mingling it with oil type? With what was the golden spoon filled? What does this incense represent? Why was it acceptable to the Lord until 1917? What did it do for the ethical effects of the symbolic understanding of the Lord's

Supper and for antitypical Nahshon? What is proved by Nahshon's bringing the three vessels to the altar? By their gold and silver?

(35) What do vs. 15-17 show? In how many forms were the animal sacrifices brought? What do the burnt offerings type? The sin offerings? The peace offerings? What do the bullock, the ram and the lamb type in the burnt offering? The kid of the goats in the sin offering? The oxen, the rams, the he goats and the lambs in the peace offering? What is typed by the lamb in the burnt offering and in the peace offering being one year old? What seven things prove that the crown-lost leaders of the twelve denominations are typed by the twelve princes? How do they prove this?

(36) What has been treated of so far in this chapter? What will not be necessary as to certain details from verse 19 on? Why not? Wherein does the difference in the twelve sets of offerings consist? What will this move us to do with the similar details?

(37) What was the time difference in the offering of the typical princes? How does this appear in the antitype? How does it not appear in the antitype? Give examples of the time succession in an antitypical camp. Give examples implying no time succession as in the different camps. Why must we retain these facts?

(38) What was the special doctrinal stewardship of the Christian or Disciple denomination? Who first announced it? When? Compare his work with Zwingli's, and antitypical Nethaniel's with antitypical Nahshon's. Who joined in this work with him?

(39) Who was the most prominent one to join in this work? Who was his son? Like whom did the latter in this movement act? When did his father enter the movement? What were the father's relations with Bro. Stone? What were their points of similarity?

(40) Who turned this movement into a sect? What names did this sect take? What did Calvin do with the Zwinglian movement? In what respects did Calvin and Alexander Campbell wrongly do alike? Who was—the chief member of antitypical Nethaniel? Who were his chief colaborers? For what were they ever ready? In what ways was Alexander Campbell pre-eminent? What were the subjects of his chief debates? With whom were they held? How did they result?

(41) What was the special truth committed to the Christian or Disciple denomination? Who was antitypical Nethaniel? What three things did they present? What were the types of these? Explain the application of the meaning of Nethaniel and Zuar to the crown-lost leaders of this denomination.

(42) What did antitypical Nethaniel's charger do? What were two evils against which it witnessed? What were the evils of sectarianism against which it witnessed? What were the evils of creedism against which it witnessed? How did this antitypical charger point out the removal of these evils? How did God treat this antitypical charger?

(43) How did antitypical Nethaniel offer his bowl? How did it stand related to the denominational views on creedism? To what two creeds did it give additional opposition? In what forms were the denominational views drawn up? What did these denominations do with the position of antitypical Nethaniel? How did he refute the evils of creedism? How did he defend the correctness of his view of this subject? What was the shibboleth of antitypical Nethaniel? What should be our judgment as to its truthfulness? Wherein lies its strength? What did it give its advocates in debate?

(44) What was antitypical Nethaniel's golden spoon? How did he show its conduciveness to righteousness so far as concerns: God? Christ? The Brethren? What graces especially is it calculated to develop?

(45) What things will not here be treated? Why not? Where should we look for these details?

(46) Whom does Eliab, the son of Helon, type? What denomination is the antitype of the tribe of Zebulun? How does the name Zebulun suggest the Adventists? What is meant by the words, Eliab and Helon? What do these names suggest in the crown-lost leaders of the Adventists? How is power shown as the central thought in the teachings of the three denominations antitypically East of the Tabernacle?

(47) Who started the Second Advent movement? By whom was he typed in this? Give a brief account of his earlier life. When did he begin to witness conversationally and in lectures on the Second Advent? What three lines of thought did he especially stress? What great errors did he hold until death? What did he do about his mistake? While so doing, what did he not give up? When did he

first expect our Lord's return? What date did he later fix for it? What were his views on the 1260, 1290, 1335 and 2300 days? On what three items respecting the Second Advent was he not clear? What is a proper judgment on his main time periods? How is his movement to be estimated?

(48) What four doctrines stressed by various Adventists did God not give through Bro. Miller? Why could two others of them not be the special teaching of the Miller movement? Which one of the three things stressed by him had not been stressed by any previous movement? What does this make that teaching in the Advent system? What facts prove this? Who offered in connection with this special teaching?

(49) With what event did Bro. Miller commence the 70 weeks and the 2300 days? What influenced him to do this? When did he make the 2300 days end? When did he begin his 1260, 1290 and 1335 days? What moved him so to do? What quality did his general position have? What was evidently incorrect in this position? Why could he not see all the points clearly? What should not and what should be our attitude toward him? How should we estimate his mission and his character as a servant of the Lord? In common with the teachings of all other reformers, what was the character of his views of his special teaching? Give two illustrations. How should we regard these?

(50) What doctrine was especially entrusted to the Adventists? About how many sects of Adventists are there? What have they done with Bro. Miller's time periods? What did Little Flock brethren among them learn about 1859? What accounts for the varying dates, 1873 and 1874? How did they come to this thought? What have Adventists usually done with date fixing since 1874? Why are they blind to the Lord's return as having set in during 1874? Who were the main members of antitypical Eliab? What use did they not, and what use did they make of Bro. Miller's time periods since 1874? What reason do they give for this? How do they describe the time since 1844? What do they concede of the Advent's date?

(51) What three things has Eliab—type and antitype—offered? According to this, what were they to show regarding time prophecy connected with the Lord's return? What was their antitypical charger? What have remembering

and forgetting the Lord's return occasioned? What was one of the first perversions of the great apostacy? What did its acceptance effect in the practice of Church leaders? What did this introduce into the Church? Henceforth on what was stress mainly laid? What did the Church become to multitudes? In what did this result? What are some of the wrong ideals and bad qualities that came from this result? What qualities in the primitive Church did these ideals displace in the Church?

(52) From what have these evil qualities always resulted? What has always fostered good qualities and set aside the false hope? Why is this? What does the true hope do in its holder? What does it purge out of him? What use did antitypical Eliab make of the imminence of this hope as an antitypical charger? What was the result of such teaching? In whose lives do we see this result? In effecting this result by his teaching; what did antitypical Eliab do?

(53) What does Eliab's bowl type? What did the Miller movement attract? What did this influence some scholars to do? Who were the main opponents of the Miller movement? Did all attack the same things in Bro. Miller's views? Why not? What did some of them teach as to the character of the days in the time periods? In what two ways did antitypical Eliab refute this view? What were the views of some of them on the fourth kingdom of Dan. 7 and 8? How did antitypical Eliab refute them? How did some of them apply the little horn? How did antitypical Eliab refute them? How did some of them apply the 1260 and the 1290 days? How did antitypical Eliab refute them? What is the real date at which they began? Why? What has antitypical Eliab been compelled to do as to the hope connected with the date 1844, and what has he failed to give respecting it? What error on the Lord's return has he disproven, and what truth thereon has he proven? In all these refutations what has he accomplished?

(54) What else has antitypical Eliab offered? Of what is it the antitype? In connection with what doctrine was it offered? In addition to a cleansing work, what does "that blessed hope" also effect? Explain in detail in each case how antitypical Eliab used this teaching to incite to hope, love, patience, heavenly-mindedness, obedience, humility, meekness and zeal. What did antitypical Eliab thus offer?

CHAPTER V.

THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES (CONTINUED). Num. 7: 30-47.

THE OFFERING OF ANTITYPICAL ELIZUR. OF ANTITYPICAL SHELUMIEL. OF ANTITYPICAL ELIASAPH. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

AFTER treating of the offerings of the princes of the three tribes east of the tabernacle, Num. 7 proceeds to describe the offerings of the princes of the three tribes south of the tabernacle—Reuben, Simeon and Gad. The prince of the first of these tribes was Elizur (my God is a rock), the son of Shedeur (light-spreader). Our study on the Gospel-Age Israelites (Chap. I) showed us that the tribe of Reuben represents the Greek Catholics and their Church, that Jacob begetting Reuben of Leah represents Little Flock leaders starting by the pertinent Truth the Little Flock movement that was by crown-lost leaders perverted into the Greek Catholic Church. Had there been no other sectarian movement later, we would call this sect the Catholic Church, which it was called until it was divided into the Greek and the Roman Catholic Churches. Thus its adherents originally embraced those who were under the eastern patriarchs—those of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople and Jerusalem—and those under the western patriarch—the one of Rome; the first four after the division presiding over the Greek, and the last one over the Roman Catholic Church. It is partly because the pertinent controversies in the main broke out and were mainly fought out by the Orientals that we give the name Greek Catholic to the first Christian sect. The Greek Catholic Church has, above all other churches, developed and advocated the doctrines of the trinity and of the God-man. These doctrines as a whole and in many of their phases being grossly erroneous, cannot be the doctrines with

which Little Flock leaders began the movement that was later perverted into the Greek Catholic Church by crown-lost leaders. Thus we see evidenced in the Greek Catholic Church the main stress laid on false teachings not given by the Little Flock leaders starting the movement that changed into the Greek Catholic Church. This same perverse phenomenon is manifest in the Presbyterian Church, where principal stress is laid on absolute predestination and reprobation of individuals instead of on the symbolic teaching of the memorial bread and wine, in the Christian Church where immersion for forgiveness of sins is mainly stressed instead of the unity of the Church based on the Bible alone as creed, and in the Adventist Church where Christ's return visibly in the flesh is the prominent teaching instead of chronology.

(2) What, then, is the teaching that Little Flock leaders gave as the vitalizing spark of the movement that was later perverted into the Greek Catholic Church by its crown-lost leaders? It was the doctrine of the office of Christ before, during and after the days of His flesh, as God's Special Representative. The Little Flock member who primarily gave by this teaching the impetus to the movement that was later perverted into the Greek Catholic Church was no less a personage than the Apostle John. All of his writings were composed in the tenth decade of the first century—between 90 and 100 A. D. In the office of Christ, they stress the Logos' existence and work of Christ as God's Representative in Creation (John 1: 1-3; 3: 13; 6: 62; 8: 56-58; 16: 28; 17: 5; Rev. 3: 14). They stress His carnation to become man's Savior (John 1: 14; 3: 16; 1: 17; 1 John 4: 2, 3). They stress His giving Himself as man's propitiation in His office work (1 John 2: 2; 4: 10). They stress His ministry for the deliverance of the Church now and of the world by and by (1 John 2: 1; 3: 2; John 17: 21, 23). Thus we see that in these and in many other passages John stressed our Lord's office work before, during and

after the days of His flesh. There were between 90 and 100 A. D. special errors that required John to stress the office work of our Lord from these three standpoints. Some—especially Jewish heretics—denied His pre-existence. Gnostics denied His exclusive preexistence work as God's Special Representative in Creation. Still others—the Docetists—denied the actuality of His death and resurrection as our Savior. Still others denied His present office work toward the Church and His future office work toward the world. There was a fifth set of errors by reason of which John stressed the office work of the Lord—the developing teachings of Antichrist, culminating several centuries later partly in the God-man and trinity doctrines. John's main helpers in this teaching were Ignatius of Antioch, who died at the mouth of lions about 108 or 115 A. D., and Polycarp of Smyrna, who died at the stake about 153 or 165 A. D., after 85 years of consecrated living, whose death occurred when he was over 100 years old. The office work of Christ as God's Special Representative was, therefore, the doctrine whose stewardship God entrusted to the Greek Catholic Church.

(3) The fact that the crown-lost leaders in the Greek Catholic Church more or less corrupted this doctrine accounts in part for the fact that they, like the other eleven crown-lost groups, are not represented in the type as bringing a silver or gold cup as a part of their offerings, the other reason being this, that Little Flock members, John, etc., presented this doctrine, offered this cup. These crown-lost leaders are typed by Elizur (my God is a rock, or a mighty rock), because Christ's office as the central work of the Lord's plan is a symbolic rock—a mighty truth (Matt. 16: 18), whose stewardship was committed to them. In this office our Lord is the wisdom, as well as the power of God (1 Cor. 1: 24; 2: 7). He and His office are the chief part in the mystery (Col. 1: 27). The name *Shedeur* (light

spreader) is appropriate to them antitypically, because the office work of Christ makes Him the light of the world (John 1: 9; 9: 5), and those ministering to that doctrine of necessity are light-spreaders. Having the doctrine of Christ's office work as their stewardship teaching, Christ in this respect being the concentration of God's wisdom, the Greek Catholic Church is appropriately represented as one of the three denominations (the Roman and Anglican Catholic Churches being the other two) that stand for the *wisdom* of God, typed by Reuben, Simeon and Gad, whose camp was to the south of the tabernacle. But the Greek Catholic crown-lost leaders corrupted more or less the doctrine of the office work of our Lord by their doctrine of the trinity and of Christ's alleged God-manhood. These corruptions apply to the relation of His office work to the Father before, during and after the days of His flesh. Origen, one of the ablest of the Church fathers, a theological professor at Alexandria, Egypt, about 240 A. D. introduced the first great corruption, alleging the Logos' eternity, though still holding to His subordination to the Father. Dionysius of Rome about 262 A. D. introduced the idea of His consubstantiality and equality with the Father; and Athanasius of Alexandria about 320 became their champion as against Arius, who from 318 onward fought these errors. Despite these, antitypical Elizur offered his charger, bowl and spoon.

(4) Antitypical Elizur ministered the doctrine of the office of Christ before, during and after the days of His flesh, as a means of correction of unrighteousness—offered the antitypical charger. They used it to rebuke and correct disobedience by showing how Jesus in exercising His creative office as Logos shunned disobedience and thus kept Himself from disregarding the Father's creative plans, and thereby kept Himself from injuring their execution. They used His Logos activity in revealing the Word to the Old Testament writers

and the accompanying arrangements, to correct the conduct of those who sought to introduce into the Christian Church errors of doctrine and life and wrongs of arrangement. They used His carnation as a correction of power-graspers who desired to exalt themselves instead of abasing themselves for the advancement of God's cause and people. They used His overcoming Satan's temptations in the wilderness and elsewhere as a rebuke to those who succumbed to his temptations. They used His humbly sacrificing Himself daily in the interests of God's plan as a correction of those who, claiming to be God's servants, were living a life of proud self-indulgence. They used His faithful giving up of Himself unto death for sin as an argument to make its terrible nature and awful effects hateful, and thus rebuked and corrected all who loved sin for prizing that which slew our Lord. They set forth His humbling Himself unto death and His exaltation unto the right hand of God as a corrector of all who sought exaltation apart from loyalty to God, His cause and people. They taught His intercessory work as a correction of impenitence, in order that such work might be obtained on one's behalf. They held up His present loving ministry as a rebuke and correction to those who by sin were despising His ministry on their behalf. They preached His zeal to cleanse by the Spirit, Word and providence of God the Lord's people from filthiness of the flesh and spirit, as a corrector of error, sin, selfishness and worldliness.

(5) Nor were such teachings in vain as to their effects. They proved to be a first-class means of helping many to correct their wrong lives. Remembering that centuries of heathenism had depraved the European, African and Asiatic peoples where the Greek Church labored, we at once recognize that there was much need of such cleansing work among the converts from heathendom. Such preaching helped them to put aside the awful corruption of morals incident to ancient

heathenism. Such teaching put away from home life infanticide and the exposure of the aged and of the weak and deformed infants. It put aside the custom of treating wives as slaves and slaves as beasts. Parental tyranny was given up. The exploitation of the poor was ameliorated, and their sufferings assuaged. The blood-thirstiness of the populace was reformed. The terrible crimes of the arena were set aside. Cruel and unusual tortures were abrogated. Social vice was greatly decreased. Business dishonesty was reformed. Enmities were healed. Feuds were broken up. Debauchery greatly declined. Disregard for human life was largely overcome. Cruelty to the unfortunate was softened. The grind of poverty was eased. Profanity was largely banished. Conjugal infidelity greatly decreased. Slander and false-witnessing received setbacks. Plundering one's neighbor and over-reaching him in bargains greatly decreased. Thus the doctrine of the office of Christ was so presented as to correct much misconduct. Thus antitypical Elizur offered his charger, and that with much fruitfulness.

(6) He likewise offered his bowl—refutative teachings. Many and varied were the attacks that Satan made through his servants on our Lord's office work in His pre-human, human and post-human activities. In meeting some of these attacks, antitypical Elizur sometimes went to the opposite extreme and taught errors. In this way he developed the trinity and God-man doctrines. Nevertheless, he defended our Lord's office work in its threefold aspect against many and varied attacks. We will do well to note these attacks and the refutations that antitypical Elizur offered to them. About 170 A. D. the first decided opposition to our Lord's pre-human office as the Father's Special Representative in Creation was made, and that by a sect called the Alogians—No-Wordians. They denied that there ever was such a being as the Word—the Logos—that our Lord ever had any pre-existence. To maintain

their position they were forced by antitypical Elizur's quotations from John's writings against them to deny the genuineness of the fourth Gospel and of the Revelation as coming from John, or from any other inspired writer. Thus they were driven away from faith in vital parts of the Bible, so successfully did antitypical Elizur refute them. About 190 a certain Theodosius, the tanner, who, to escape death denied Christ, began to teach that Christ was not the Lord's agency in Creation, alleging that He first came into existence when conceived by Mary from the Holy Spirit. He was refuted by antitypical Elizur with quotations like John 1: 1-3, 14; 3: 13; 6: 62; 8: 56-58; 16: 28; 17: 5; Rev. 3: 14, as well as with some from Paul's writings, like Phil. 2: 5-8; Col. 1: 15-17.

(7) Sabellius, an Egyptian, after 215 A. D. began to teach modalism, which denies Christ's pre-human existence as the Logos and God's Special Representative in Creation. He taught that there is but one God—one person—who appeared in three modes. Hence his theory was called modalism. According to him this one God as the Father was the Creator, and the Law Giver in the Old Testament. Then this one God, the Father, became the Son by carnation, and as the Son, died for man. Thereafter this one God who first existed as Father, afterward as Son, became the Holy Spirit to do the work of sanctification for the Church. Sabellius denied that there were three Gods or three persons in God, but taught that there were three manifestations or modes of revelation of the one God. This, of course, did away with the Logos' existence and work as that of a person separate from the Father. Antitypical Elizur refuted this by showing the contrasts in John 1: 1-3 between God and the Logos, and by presenting the Latter as the Agent of God in Creation. Some of his members did this by showing that the Logos was created by God before all other creatures (Rev. 3: 14; Col. 1: 15); and all of them taught

that He then was used as God's Agent to create all other things (Col. 1: 15-17). He refuted the idea that there was no Father during the days of Christ's flesh, by quoting passages where Christ prays to the Father, like Matt. 11: 25-27; 26: 39-44; John 17: 1-26; and by stressing his sacrifice as being made to God by Christ as a Priest in atonement for sin, etc. (Heb. 9: 13-23; 7: 27; 2: 17, 18, etc.). He refuted the thought that there was no Christ and consequently no High-priestly ministry since the Spirit has been sanctifying the Church, by quoting passages proving such a ministry, like John 14: 16; Rom. 8: 34; Eph. 2: 18; Heb. 3: 1; 4: 14, 15; 6: 17; 8: 1, 2, 6; 9: 24; 10: 11-14; 1 John 2: 1, 2; etc. He likewise refuted this view by showing that Christ comes again on the Last Day, though he did not clearly see the object of our Lord's return.

(8) Another attack was made on our Lord's office as God's Special Representative by a doctrine called Patripassionism (the doctrine that the Father suffered and died), which began to be taught about 190 A. D. According to this doctrine there is no Son at all. There was only the Father, who came into the world and suffered and died for man. This view would require God's non-existence for three days. It was refuted in a manner similar to that used against Sabellius' modalism. The three main exponents of this error were Praxeas, a confessor (one who refused to deny Christ before his persecuting judges, and who succeeded in escaping martyrdom without compromising himself), who began his errors in Asia Minor, Beryllus of Arabia and Noëtus of Smyrna. Tertullian (who died 230 A. D.) refuted the first, Origen (who died 254) the second, and Hyppolitus (who died about 235 A. D.) the third. Beryllus accepted Origen's views and publicly thanked him for his helping him out of error—an unusual outcome of a theological controversy.

(9) Paul of Samosata, to whom our Pastor refers (B 292), was a staunch and powerful opponent of our

Lord's office, especially as Logos. His view of Christ was much like that of the modern Unitarians and Christadelphians, and he treated the Scriptures relating to our Lord's pre-human existence and office in the same torturous manner as they do, *i.e.*, The Logos existed as God's wisdom in God's mind only, until He was born of Mary. He, therefore, taught that there was no personal Logos, which, of course, did away with His office as God's Special Representative in Creation and in Old Testament revelation. Paul of Samosata was an able debater and a resourceful politician, and he used both of these powers to defend himself against the members of antitypical Elizur who attacked his error. The controversy raged for years (263-272 A. D.), and three large synods were held in which the subjects at issue were exhaustively debated, before it was ended in the complete defeat and dislodgement of the doughty Paul.

(10) There have been many other attacks made on our Lord's office in its three times of exercise, both before and since the Reformation; but antitypical Elizur has been able to meet and defeat all of them. The arguments that he framed have frequently been used by theologians of other denominations than the Greek Catholic Church, but with very little additions to those that antitypical Elizur offered as his bowl. *E.g.*, when Servetus, who taught the Truth on the unity of God, but error on the Logos, presented his errors against Calvin, the latter, unable to meet his arguments on the unity of God, did use Elizur's arguments against Servetus' errors on the Logos, and with these certainly refuted them. Had Servetus the Truth on this subject and the whole Truth on the Holy Spirit, Calvin would have been hopelessly outmatched in his argument with Servetus, as he was in the argument on the unity of God, and in part on the Holy Spirit. Even in our day antitypical Elizur continues to refute attacks against Christ's office as God's Special Representative before,

during and after the days of His flesh. So doing, antitypical Elizur has nearly throughout the entire Gospel Age been offering his bowl.

(11) So, too, has he been offering his golden spoon—instructions in righteousness—connected with Christ's office before, during and after the days of His flesh. Here a rich field of instruction in righteousness was opened up for antitypical Elizur's use. From Christ's pre-existent joy in creating all things they drew the lesson of our rejoicing in the Lord's work. From His doing the work of creation exactly as God outlined, they drew the lesson of obedience to God's will for their hearers' benefit. From His successful accomplishment of creation and the Old Testament revelation by using God's instrumentalities in harmony with His will they drew the lesson of efficiency as resulting from our using God's instrumentalities in His ways to fulfill His will. From Christ's willingness to leave heaven and become a human being to please the Father and carry out His plan they exhorted their hearers to abase self in order to please God and further His purposes.

(12) From Christ's consecrating Himself at Jordan to sacrifice Himself to God on behalf of God's plan they encouraged their hearers to consecrate themselves unto God in His interests. From Christ's faithfully serving God's cause they preached that their hearers should faithfully serve God's cause. From Christ's developing and manifesting in His office work faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love, charity, humility, simplicity, industry, self-sacrificingness, long-suffering, forbearance, liberality, temperance, frugality, peace, joy, meekness, obedience, zeal, gentleness, faithfulness, etc., they encouraged their hearers to cultivate all these fruits and graces of the Spirit. In these respects they held Him up as an example for imitation as to these graces, and this was a powerful instruction in righteousness. When they stressed the death of

Christ for man's sin, they drew the lesson of laying down life for God on behalf of His plan. His readiness and His promptness and devotion to fulfill His office work afforded them lessons to apply to their hearers for obedience. His trustfulness at death in committing His future to, and in depositing His life-rights with, the Father served as a splendid text to encourage their hearers to do likewise. Christ's death as an expression of God's and His love they held up as an exhortation to show similar love.

(13) Many, too, are the instructions in righteousness that antitypical Elizur has drawn from His ministry since He left the flesh. His willingness to receive all that come to Him they applied to their hearers to use as an inspiration to receive all that come to them for such help as His office warrants their giving. His faithfulness in appearing in the presence of God for us they used to stimulate faithfulness in their hearers' calling. His interceding for them they used in urging their hearers to imitate by praying for others. His teaching people as to God's plan they used to encourage their hearers not only to respond to the call, but also to encourage others to respond to it. His justifying the repentant and believing they used as a means of helping them to encourage others to repentance and faith. His sanctifying the Church they presented in such a way as to help their hearers to stimulate others to consecrate their humanity to God, faithfully to lay it down unto death and to develop a Christlike character while laying down life for God. His bringing the Faithful to victory in the daily battles of the Christian life they applied in ways to incite their hearers to fight the good fight of faith. His promising the Faithful ultimate victory and the glorious heavenly inheritance they used to arouse their hearers to faithfulness unto death. In these and other ways they presented many instructions in righteousness from the Biblical teachings on Christ's pre-human, human and post-human

office. Thus antitypical Elizur offered the antitypical golden spoon full of sweet incense.

(14) We have now finished our study of the fourth prince's offering—type and antitype. Antitypical Elizur had as a doctrine in connection with which he offered corrective, refutative and ethical teachings, the richest of the four doctrines so treated by the four princes whose Gospel-Age offerings we have so far studied; for Christ's office as Jehovah's Special Representative is one of the richest doctrines of the whole Bible. In it the wisdom of God finds one of its highest expressions. No wonder the antitypical tribe that has received this doctrine as its stewardship teaching is placed on that side of the antitypical Tabernacle that exhibits the Divine wisdom. Antitypical Elizur fulfilling the type of Num. 7: 30-35, was an unconscious witness to God's Book; for his activities are a fulfillment of prophecy, given in typical form in Num. 7: 30-35.

(15) The next set of crown-lost leaders that are brought to our attention by the type (Num. 7: 36-41) is that which perverted into the Roman Catholic Church a Little Flock movement based on the truth that there is but one Church, which in its catholicity (entirety) is the steward of the Truth, to preserve it from error and attacks of errorists and to administer it to the blessing of the responsive. The starter of this Little Flock movement was Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp, who in turn was a disciple of St. John, the Apostle. Irenaeus was born between 115 and 125 A. D. at or near Smyrna, Asia Minor, where he became an apt pupil of Polycarp, from whom he imbibed a rich fund of Truth and of the Spirit of the Truth, as well as some accounts of St. John's life not set forth in the Scriptures. Later he was sent as a missionary from Smyrna to Gaul (now France) and was stationed at Lyons and Vienne, where he first became a presbyter and later (in 178 A. D.) the bishop. Here and elsewhere he labored by voice and pen with perseverance

and success. After 190 A. D. no certain trace of him can be found, though a tradition that originated several hundred years later—an almost certain evidence of its untrustworthiness—says that he died a martyr in 202 A. D.

(16) The Greek word *eirenaios*, Latinized as *irenaeus*, means *peaceable*; and certainly this was a marked characteristic of Irenaeus, who seemingly is the third member of the Smyrna Church star, St. John and Polycarp being his predecessors as parts of that star. He mediated between the Oriental and Occidental Church in the controversy on the Memorial date, the Roman bishop, Victor, sectarianly disfellowshiping the Oriental brethren, because they clung to Nisan 14 as against the innovation of the Roman Church. Thus Irenaeus preserved them as a united whole—catholic—as against a division. But Irenaeus' main work was to teach the truth on the one Church as a whole in its stewardship of the Truth against the separation of the false teachers of Gnosticism, which was a combination of heathen (Persian, Indian, Egyptian and Greek) views with various perversions of Christian views. His chief literary product was a work against all heresies, in which he vindicated the Christian Truth against every error that had arisen up to his time, and that had come in contact with Christianity. It was while engaged in oral and literary work of this kind that he gave the truth—the one Church entire is the steward of the Truth—that started a Little Flock movement to preserve the catholicity—wholeness—of the Church as against separatistic movements from within and without the Church. He speaks of the Church as "the haven of rescue, the means of salvation, the entrance to life, the paradise in this world, of whose trees, to wit, the Holy Scriptures, we may eat, excepting the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is all grace." "Who separates

himself from the Church renounces the fellowship of the Spirit." "Only at the breast of the Church can we be nursed to life." "To her must we flee to be made partakers of the Holy Spirit." "Heretics are enemies of the Truth and of the catholicity of the one Church."

(17) But to understand clearly the particular part of the Truth that Irenaeus gave as the impulse to the movement to preserve from separatism the one Church in its wholeness, as the steward of the Truth, and as the administrator of the Lord's grace, we must recognize the twofold sense of the use of the word *church* in the Bible—the Real and the Nominal Church. Primarily and fundamentally the Real Church is the Body of Christ alone—those justified and Spirit-begotten ones who are Christ's faithful members—"the Church which is His Body." Secondarily, the Real Church consists of all new creatures, both the crown-retainers and the crown-losers—"the Church of the firstborn." In these two parts the Real Church has been called invisible, in the sense that no one could be absolutely certain of any other particular individual's present membership therein, apart from himself. In these two parts, up to 1917, the Church has properly been called the Real Church. But the word *church* is used in another sense—the nominal church—the whole company of those who profess to be the Lord's, whether they are so in reality or not. In this sense of the word not only are the Little Flock and the Great Company, but also the justified and those unjustified who profess to be Christ's—hypocritical professors—are included. Locally, such found a local organization called a church, representative of the whole Church. When Irenaeus speaks of the Church in its wholeness—catholicity—he does not mean only the Little Flock and the Great Company, *i.e.*, the Real Church, but also all other professed Christians, *i.e.*, he means the nominal church. But he speaks of the nominal church as the Church because of the Real Church's presence in

it as a part of it. To leave the nominal church before the cleansed Sanctuary and harvest time, therefore, actually meant to leave the Real Church, if one was of it. So viewed, his advocacy of their being but one Church, which is the steward and administrator of the Truth, was the advocacy of a Scriptural doctrine. It was in this way that Irenaeus set in operation the movement to preserve the Truth as to the office of the one Church, *i.e.*, that as a part of antitypical Jacob he begat antitypical Simeon.

(18) Experience and observation prove that there is a Real and a Nominal Church, which must be so defined as to make the Real a part of the nominal church up to the destruction of the church systems; for while the Little Flock left Babylon—the systems—by April 18, 1916, there will be Great Company members, who are a part of the Real Church, in the systems until they are destroyed. The Scriptures so teach. The wheat and the tares were to grow together until the Harvest (Matt. 13: 28-30, 41, 42). The tares are all the unconsecrated professors of Christ. No new creature is a tare. The field is the world in the sense of the nominal church, even as Jesus called the Jewish church the world (John 15: 18, 19). This is more especially manifest in some of the Epistles, which were written to special churches, *e.g.*, like that at Rome, etc., as well as to the General Church. Thus Rom. 12: 1 is addressed primarily to the justified and, secondarily, to the consecrated; Gal. 6: 1 deals with both classes (the natural and the spiritual) as of the church; Jas. 5: 1-6 is evidently addressed to nominal as distinct from real Christians at the end of the Age. This is also true of Jas. 4: 4, 5 and part of 8. Fleshly Israel is a type of Spiritual Israel, Real and nominal (Heb. 3: 7—4: 2; 1 Cor. 10: 5-11). This truth is also shown in the seven churches of Rev. 1-3; for in these chapters, as parts of the Church sometimes the Lord addresses His real followers and sometimes those who merely profess

to be His followers, but who are not such, *e.g.*, certain ones who have not had their justification vitalized, *i.e.*, unconsecrated persons (Rev. 3: 18). All of these Scriptures show that as God called both nominal and Real Israel His chosen people, so He has also called nominal and Real Spiritual Israel His Church.

(19) Up to 1878 God always used the nominal church as the steward of the Truth after it was given to it (Rev. 3: 10). While He always first gave the meat in due season through the Apostles and the special-mouthpiece secondarily prophets to the nominal church, the Truth was made the stewardship of all professed Christians to the extent that they could receive it, *i.e.*, of the whole one nominal church. This stewardship implied (1) that the Church as *custodian* of the Truth preserve it and defend it against error and (2) that the Church as *administrator* of the Truth teach and spread it to the blessing of the responsive. Let us not lose sight of the thought that it was the nominal church to whom this stewardship of the Truth was given, as the seven letters to the seven churches abundantly prove. The nominal church as the container of the Real Church in each epoch of the Church is the antitypical candlestick in each epoch of the Church, according to Rev. 1—3. On this point many labor under the mistaken impression that the terms *nominal* and *real* are mutually exclusive terms. They are not: for the Real Church has been a part of the nominal church. It is to the nominal church what the hub is to the wheel. It is the most important part of the nominal church; for the nominal church consists of all who profess to be Christ's, both those who are really His and those who are not really His, though claiming to be His, *i.e.*, the Little Flock, the Great Company, the justified and the unjustified professors of Christ. Accordingly, the thoughts set forth in the preceding and in this paragraph enable us to see how Irenaeus, by unweariedly teaching that there is but

one church catholic—entire—*i.e.*, the nominal church, which is the steward and administrator of God's Truth, set into operation a movement to preserve it from all separatistic teachers of error who would break up the Church and disable it as steward and administrator of the Truth from guarding and administering it to the blessing of the responsive.

(20) It was certainly an active movement, and was called into being especially on account of the efforts of the various Gnostic sects to pervert the Truth of God committed to the one Church and to break up the Church as the steward of the Truth. By Irenaeus' labors above those of any other individual was Gnosticism given its death blow. It had made considerable headway within the Church; but its overwhelming refutation by Irenaeus, whose arguments proved to be a veritable arsenal to the other teachers in the Church, very shortly drove it out of the Church altogether, and it shortly afterwards died. But Irenaeus used this truth against false teachers in the Church. He used it, *e.g.*, to confute the Alogians, proving that their doctrine was contrary to that handed down by St. John and Polycarp on the pre-existence of the Logos. He used it to show that minor questions like the date for the Memorial should not be permitted to destroy the fellowship between the Eastern and Western Church. In fact his activities in the movement that he created deepened the conviction in the Church that the entire Church is but one and should preserve its entirety—catholicity—by faithfully acting as the steward and administrator of the Truth against all separatism of error and in favor of helping the helpable. But this movement was given a bent that perverted it into the Roman Catholic Church. And to this Church, as distinct from the papacy, which by usurpation has gotten control of it, the Lord committed as a stewardship the doctrine that there is but one Church—nominal—which is the steward and administrator of the

Truth, to preserve it against errorists and to administer it for the blessing of the responsive. And while the Roman Catholic Church has gone woefully wrong on the doctrine of the Real and nominal Church, ignoring this distinction altogether, and claiming that it, a sect, is the only true Church, it has through all its vicissitudes maintained the truth that there is but one Church, which is the steward of God's Truth, to preserve it against error and to administer it to the blessing of the responsive.

(21) This particular truth, like all other truths, is a stewardship of the True Church, the mystery of God; for in ultimate analysis it is the Real Church, as teacher, which is the one Church, and which is the steward and administrator of the Truth, to preserve and defend it from error and to administer it for the blessing of the responsive. And it is because the Real Church is included in the nominal church that the nominal church has charge of the Truth, to preserve and administer it. Therefore, in reality, the teaching that the Roman Catholic Church has as its special truth is that of the office of the Real Church, which with its Head, as the hidden mystery of God, is the greatest expression of God's wisdom found in His plan. Thus the Roman Church as antitypical Simeon is properly typed by a tribe that dwelt to the south of the tabernacle, where that which symbolized God's wisdom was the standard. The Greek Catholic Church stressing as its special truth the office of Christ, who in His office with the Church is the highest expression of God's wisdom, had at its side on the antitypical South of the antitypical Tabernacle the Roman Catholic Church stressing the office of the Church, which with its Head is the highest expression of God's wisdom. Thus the Roman Catholic Church is very properly to the South of the antitypical Tabernacle, *i.e.*, its special mission is to defend in reality a truth in which God's wisdom is centrally expressed.

(22) In a Church of so many centuries' standing, like the Roman Catholic Church, there would of course be a very large number of crown-lost leaders, who would constitute the antitype of Shelumiel (*peace of* God), the son of Zurishaddai (*my rock is almighty*), the prince of Simeon. Among these in the earlier days are especially two crown-lost leaders who were very influential in turning into the Roman Catholic sect the Little Flock movement inaugurated by Irenaeus on the line of maintaining the one Church catholic as the steward and administrator of God's Truth. These were Cyprian of Carthage and Augustine of Hippo, both thus being of Pro-consular Africa, now called Tunesia, to the east of Algeria, then called Africa for short. Both did much in developing Roman Catholicism along the line of apostolic succession of bishops, and both of them have in many of their main positions been repudiated by the later papacy, which however outwardly professes the highest regard for them as great lights. But these two men doubtless did much to vindicate and apply to correction and instruction in righteousness the truth given through Irenaeus, that there is but one Church which in its catholicity is the steward and administrator of the Truth. Into this doctrine they wove the errors of apostolic succession and of the one Church as being based in its unity on its bishops. Cyprian came from a celebrated pagan family living at Carthage, and, at first, was a teacher of rhetoric, was converted to Christianity in 245 A.D., became a presbyter shortly afterwards and was made bishop of Carthage in 248 A. D. In 250 A. D. he had to flee before the Decian persecution to the desert, where he by letter fulfilled his office to his church. The circumstances of his times and church led him into the elaboration of the doctrine of the apostolic succession of bishops and of the unity of the Church as being based on them. Thus he is the father of the Episcopal doctrine and system of church government. The

schism of Felicissimus of Carthage and of Novatian at Rome influenced him to write much on the truth that there is but one Church, which in its catholicity is the steward and administrator of the Divine Truth. He was martyred by being beheaded at Carthage in 258 A. D. He so opposed the Roman bishop as to have been disfellowshiped by him, even dying in that condition, despite which he is a Romanist saint.

(23) Augustine was undoubtedly the greatest and ablest of the Church fathers. He was born in 354 A. D. at Tagaste, Numidia. His mother was the pious Monica, the classic example of pious mothers of wayward sons whom their prayers pursue unto conversion. By many very able men outside the Roman Church he is considered as having had greater intellectual powers than any other fallen member of the human family. He tasted the depth of iniquity while pursuing the learning of the schools of his day. Later he became a teacher of secular branches. After a checkered career he was converted about 385 A. D. in Milan, Italy, and in 388 returned to Africa. He became a presbyter at Hippo, Africa, in 391 A. D., bishop there in 396, and for 34 years acted as the oracle of the entire Western Church, dying in 430 A. D. He carried on three far-reaching and long-drawn-out controversies: (1) against Manicheans, (2) against the Donatists and (3) against the Pelagians, besides many less important ones. It was particularly in his controversy with the Donatists that he did the most effective work of all the members of antitypical Shelumiel on behalf of the truth that there is but one Church, which in its catholicity is the steward and administrator of God's Truth, *i.e.*, offered antitypical Shelumiel's charger, bowl and spoon. This controversy lasted for eleven years (400-411) and was brought to a fairly successful issue at a conference held by 287 Donatists and 279 Catholic bishops at Carthage, Augustine being the main mouthpiece of the latter, and

Petilian of the former. Shortly after this conference Donatism began slowly to decrease until it finally died out.

(24) It will be helpful to us better to appreciate the offerings of antitypical Shelumiel, if we note briefly the salient features of the Felicissimian, Novatian and the Donatist schims, which furnished the occasions of the main offering of antitypical Shelumiel's charger, bowl and spoon. These three schisms were very much alike in their origins, principles and accompaniments. The Felicissimian and Novatianion schisms arose in 251 A. D. Felicissimus and Novatian were presbyters in the church at Carthage and Rome respectively. The latter was a talented theological writer. Decius, the Emperor, initiated a severe persecution of the whole Church of the Roman Empire in 250 A. D., death being usually meted out to all apprehended Christians who did not renounce Christ, sacrifice to the gods and surrender the Church's Bibles and other books to the civil authorities for burning. Many weak Christians became apostates, sacrificing to the gods and delivering the Bibles, etc., to the authorities for destruction. Among others, at Rome, Fabian, bishop of Rome was martyred, 250 A. D. After a year's lapse without a successor being elected, two of his presbyters, Cornelius and Novatian, were candidates for his office, the former winning the election. What to do with those who weakly sacrificed to the gods and delivered up the sacred books to save their lives, and who after the persecution was over sought the fellowship of the brethren became a problem. Cornelius, the bishop of Rome, advocated their reinstatement after a season of penance. Novatian advocated their perpetual disfellowshipment from the Church, but left them hope that a lifetime of penitence might secure for them Divine forgiveness. Controversy arose between the adherents of these two opinions. The dispute became fierce and resulted in a split in the church at Rome,

Novatian being elected the bishop of the schismatic church. In harmony with the custom of those days, the head of each party wrote to the most influential bishops of the Christian world seeking their support. In this way Cyprian, who at Carthage was having difficulty with the Felicissimus schism in which the schismatics went to the extreme opposite to that of Novatian, *i.e.*, advocating the reception of the lapsed without any notice being taken of their having renounced Christ, was the recipient of letters from Cornelius and Novatian. For two reasons Cyprian took Cornelius' side: (1) because as an apostolic (?) bishop Cornelius should be obeyed by his presbyters and laity, and (2) because he agreed with Cornelius' views as against those of Novatian. This led Cyprian to write, as condemnatory of the division, on the truth given by Irenaeus, that there is but one Church, which in its catholicity is the steward and administrator of the Truth, attaching to this truth the error of apostolic succession of bishops, as the principle which proves that to be separate from one's bishop is to be outside of the one Church, since according to the doctrine of apostolic succession the one Church is based on the bishops as the center of its unity. But despite these errors Cyprian certainly, as a part of antitypical Shelumiel, offered his part in the latter's charger, bowl and spoon.

(25) The Donatist schism set in toward the end of the Dioclesian persecution, 311 A. D., out of the same problem as that which occasioned the Novatian schism, *i.e.*, as to what should be done with those Christians who to save their lives sacrificed to the gods and delivered up the sacred books, and who now sought reconciliation with the Church. The answer was given in the same two ways in which it was given at the end of the Decian persecution sixty years before. And as on the former occasion, so on this, the advocates of each view became very combative, the trouble starting

at Carthage. The controversy was referred in 313 A. D. to Constantine, the first Christian Emperor. He appointed first, in 313, a commission of bishops under the presidency of Melchiades, bishop of Rome, and then, in 314, a great council at Arles, Gaul (France), to investigate and decide the involved questions. Both decided against those who advocated the permanent disfellowshipment of the lapsed. Constantine in 316 personally heard the case and confirmed the former decisions. In 313 Donatus became the leader of the strict party. The schism spread all over Africa, and, because the civil authorities sided with the Catholics, many of the schismatics, particularly begging and traveling monks, committed many acts of revolution and anarchy. For years, despite attacks by the army, confiscation, torture, closing of churches and exile, the Donatists held out. In 400 A. D. Augustine began his eleven years' unwearied attacks on them. Fearing his skill as a debater, they refused to meet him in synodical discussion. Finally they were compelled by the Emperor Honorius, 411 A. D., to hold a three-day discussion with the Catholic party at Carthage, at which 279 Donatist bishops and 287 Catholic bishops were present, Petilian being the chief debater for the former and Augustine for the latter. The Emperor's legate—a Catholic—was to decide on the merits of the points. He, as was expected, decided for the Catholics.

(26) Both sides failed to distinguish between the Real and the nominal Church, and debated the question from resultant wrong standpoints. Both believed the True Church to be an external organization. Augustine contended for the catholic (not papal) view of the True Church, that it is but one, that in its entirety—catholicity—is the steward and administrator of the Truth, and that all belonged to it who united themselves with the bishops as the Apostles' successors. This last view, of course, shows that Augustine was contending for a sect—the Roman Catholic Church—

as the true Church. The Donatists claimed that only the bishops who were saints were successors of the Apostles, and that only the saintly ones who were united with them were the true Church, which they claimed their sect to be. Thus both sides were in error as to what was the Real Church. But the Catholic view was on the whole nearer the truth than that of the Donatists; and on the subject of their being but one (nominal) Church, which in its catholicity was the steward and administrator of the Truth, to guard and administer it for the blessing of all the responsive, it was decidedly in the right as against the Donatist view, according to which only the saintly were benefited by its administration of the Truth, and according to which the least unsaintly act meant disfellowshipment. Such [Donatist] views accorded with the mission of and membership in neither the Real nor the nominal Church. The Catholic idea of treating with the human weaknesses of the responsive was certainly an outflow of the thought of the Church as administering the Truth for the blessing of the responsive; while the Donatist view made the Church a cold, unsympathetic institution that held out no hope, comfort nor encouragement for "those who are weak and out of the way." For varying reasons, from 429 onward Donatism was gradually given up, the Donatist bishops and churches joining the Catholic Church, their bishops retaining their official standing. The Novatian and Donatist controversies were prophesied in Matt. 13: 28, 29, the Lord's answer being given through Cyprian, Augustine, etc.

(27) Apart from the Novatian and Donatist schisms, the Roman Catholic Church has had many other opportunities to offer through her crown-lost leaders—antitypical Shelumiel—the antitypical charger, bowl and spoon; but it is unnecessary to give further details on the involved historical facts. We have given a summary of " controversy connected with the Novatian

and Donatist schisms, because they help us better to see two things: (1) how the Roman Catholic crown-lost leaders, as antitypical Shelumiel, offered their charger, bowl and spoon, and (2) how they turned into a sect the Little Flock movement begun by Irenaeus through the truth that there is but one Church, which in its entirety—catholicity—is the steward and administrator of the Truth, to defend it from error and to administer it for the blessing of the responsive. What we have said above on Cyprian's and Augustine's longsuffering labor to minister peace of heart and mind to those who were weak and out of the way, and who repented and sought reconciliation with the Lord helps us to see the appropriateness of the name Shelumiel (*peace of God*) as typical of the character of the Roman Catholic crown-lost leaders, of whom Cyprian and Augustine were splendid examples. The truth that they taught emphasized the thought of God's almighty love and forgiveness to those who are weak and out of the way. The word, Zurishaddai (*my rock is almighty*), gives this thought.

(28) Now we will proceed to show how antitypical Shelumiel offered his charger, *i.e.*, ministered the special truth committed to the Roman Catholic Church as a means of correcting misconduct. Their emphasis of the truth that there is one Church as a whole was a mighty correction to all who tried to introduce sectarian divisions. This emphasis corrected the party spirit as a wrong spirit. It stressed the danger and disastrous effect of error, and the wrong of being a teacher or supporter of error. It rebuked the pride that sought to differ from the brethren. It also rebuked the narrow spirit that despised and cast aside those who would show a spirit of variance. It condemned a harsh spirit that apparently took pleasure in rebuffing the weak. The exclusive spirit it corrected by the thought of the catholicity of the one Church. The censorious spirit that would make beams of motes and

mountains of molehills it certainly chastised with a whip of small cords. The holier-than-thou attitude of the Gospel-Age Pharisees who thanked God that they were better than the poor publicans who smote their bosoms in contrition for their weaknesses and sins and pled for forgiveness for Jesus' merit certainly received a needed correction from the way antitypical Shelumiel emphasized the Church's stewardship as the administrator of the Truth for the blessing of the responsive; for he showed that the Church in administering the Truth to such was a nurse for the sick, a haven for the storm-tossed and shaken mariner on sin's sea and a mother to the prodigal returning to his father's house. He rebuked the stern and repelling spirit of a Novatian and a Donatus, as foreign to the spirit of Jesus, the friend and receiver of sinners.

(29) On this point the fine sentiments of Cyprian that reveal a real pastor's heart in him may well be quoted. Pointing out how the repellent spirit of Novatianism is out of harmony with the true pastoral heart and would bring a shepherd in the Lord's flock condemnation, he says: "At the day of judgment it will be laid to our charge that we took no care of the wounded sheep, and on account of one that was diseased left many sound ones to perish; that while our Lord left the ninety-nine whole sheep, and went after the one that had wandered and become weary, and, when He had found it, brought it away Himself on His shoulders, we not only do not seek after the fallen, but even reject them when they return to us." In another place he rebukes this spirit in the following language: "The case stands differently with the philosophers and stoics, who say all sins are alike, and that a sound man should not easily be brought to bend. But the difference is wide betwixt philosophers and Christians. We are bound to keep aloof from what proceeds, not from God's grace, but from the pride of a severe philosophy. Our Lord says in His Gospel,

'Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful,' and 'The whole need not a physician, but the sick'; but such a physician he cannot be who says, 'I take care only of the sound' who need no physician. Behold, yonder lies thy brother wounded in battle by his enemy. On the one hand, Satan is trying to destroy him whom he has wounded; on the other, Christ exhorts us not to leave him to perish whom He has redeemed. Which cause do we espouse? On whose side do we stand? Do we help the devil finish his work of destruction? Do we, like the priest and the Levite in the Gospel, pass by our brother lying half dead? Or do we, like the priests of God and of Christ, following Christ's precept and example, snatch the wounded man from his enemy; that having done everything for his salvation, we may leave the final decision of his case to the judgment of God?" Such statements were certainly sharp corrections of the spirit that did not administer the Truth for the blessing of the responsive. These are only samples of many corrections that antitypical Shelumiel gave in serving the truth that there is but one Church, which in its catholicity is the steward and administrator of the Truth, to defend it from error and to administer it to the blessing of the responsive.

(30) Let us now consider how antitypical Shelumiel offered his antitypical bowl—refutations of errors against the truth that there is but one Church, which in its entirety—catholicity—is the steward and administrator of God's Truth, to preserve it from and against error and to administer it to the blessing of the responsive. But let us not forget that what antitypical Shelumiel understood by the one Church is not the Real Church. He meant by it, first the nominal church, then later the Roman Catholic Church; thus he was not clear on this point; for he fell into the double error (1) that the Church is the organization connected with the bishops as successors of the Apostles, and

(2) that it is identical with the Roman Catholic Church. In other words, as all other crown-lost leaders corrupted the truth underlying the Little Flock movements that they turned into sects, so antitypical Shelumiel measurably corrupted the truth given by Irenaeus when the latter started the pertinent Little Flock movement. But in spite of these corruptions, which prevented his offering an antitypical cup, he was able to defend the pertinent truth from attacks which he refuted. Thus, while he could not refute all attacks made on apostolic succession and the Roman Catholic Church as the one true Church, he could refute attacks on the doctrine that there is but one Church, which in its entirety is the steward and administrator of the Truth, to preserve and defend it from error and to administer it to the blessing of the responsive. This shows his strength and weakness.

(31) Thus antitypical Shelumiel has refuted the claim of every sect that it (that sect) is the one Church, as contradictory to the truth entrusted to the custody of the Roman Catholic Church. He refuted their claims by pointing out many errors that they taught, many truths that they rejected, the wrong organizations that they formed, the exclusion of many Christians from fellowship—a thing of which they have been guilty, the recency of their origin, the separatistic movement in which they were born, and the fractional part of Christians that they contain and the multitudes of Christians that they exclude. Therefore antitypical Shelumiel has rightly concluded that none of them is the one Church in its entirety—catholicity. But be it noted that by these very proofs antitypical Shelumiel unwittingly demonstrated that the Roman Catholic Church is not the one Church catholic, *i.e.*, that it also is a sect. So, too, has antitypical Shelumiel proved that not one of these sects is the exclusive steward of God's Truth, as each one of them claims; for he proved everyone of them to be guilty of lacking

some Truth; therefore they could not have preserved the Truth, whatever they may have done to preserve some of the Truth. Again, he proved each of them not to be the preserver of the Truth from error; for each of them has rejected more than one truth and taught various opposing errors. Again, he proved each one of them not to have administered many truths for the benefit of the responsive; for he proved each one to have failed to emphasize various truths. But, again, by these very proofs he unintentionally demonstrated that the Roman Catholic Church is also not the Church catholic, but a sect; for in each of these points it also had sinned by omission or commission. But in all these refutations antitypical Shelumiel was refuting attacks on the truth that there is but one Church, which in its entirety is the steward and administrator of the Truth, to preserve and defend it from error and to administer it for the benefit of the responsive. Thus he offered his bowl—refutative teachings.

(32) Antitypical Shelumiel likewise offered his spoon—ethical teachings, instructions in righteousness, connected with the pertinent truth of his denomination. The peculiar truth to which he ministered made him stress right living as becoming to the Christian. It also required him to stress the Church's recognition of Christ's headship, which implies a life of consecration. The principle of Christian brotherhood and fellowship likewise was a thing insisted upon by antitypical Shelumiel, as flowing out of the idea of the catholicity of the Church. Faithfulness in exercising stewardship was also an instruction in righteousness featured by him in stressing the Church as God's steward. Love for Truth and hatred for error were instructions that he gave as he ministered to the one truth committed to the Roman Catholic Church. Keeping the unity of the faith and the Church was an instruction in righteousness that he stressed as naturally flowing out of the special truth committed to the

antitypical tribe of Simeon. Sympathy for those who were weak and out of the way was another ethical teaching that antitypical Shelumiel presented. He inculcated love for the brethren as an outflow of the truth for which he stood. He encouraged a pastoral heart in the ministry and a loving meekness in the laity on behalf of those who fell into sin. He emphasized longsuffering and forgiveness in dealing with the weaknesses of the brethren, and that because of the character of the special truth of his denomination. He inculcated a love for the Church as the benefactor of all the Lord's people. He inspired zeal for the defense of the Truth, for the attack of error and for the application of the Truth to uplifting the responsive. He inculcated a conciliatory spirit and a magnanimity toward all brethren in relation to the special truth committed to his denomination. He inspired many a campaign to win back the fallen. From the above specifications we can readily see how his special truth gave a practical bent, as to Christian study, living and service, to his ethical teachings. And in teaching these things he offered the golden spoon for the tribe of antitypical Simeon.

(33) We now come in our study of the offerings of the Gospel-Age princes to the offering of the sixth set of the crown-lost leaders—those of the Episcopal Church. These are the antitype of Eliasaph, the son of Deuel (Num. 7: 42), since the Episcopal Church is the antitype of the tribe of Gad, as we have seen. In Num. 1: 14 Deuel is likewise called Deuel; but in Num. 2: 14 he is called Reuel. The Hebrew letters, *daleth* (equivalent to our *d*) and *resh* (equivalent to our *r*), look very nearly alike; and they have been interchanged in Num. 2: 14; for many manuscripts give *daleth* instead of *resh* in Num. 2: 14, whereas all manuscripts give *daleth* only in Num. 7: 42 and 1: 14. Hence we think that Deuel, and not Reuel, is the right name for the father of Eliasaph, prince of

Gad, though both can have the same meaning—knowledge of power, sight of power, *i.e.*, recognition of power. Gad, as we know, was the third tribe to the south of the tabernacle (Num. 2: 10-16) belonging to the camp of Reuben.

(34) The special doctrine that God entrusted to the Episcopal Church is this: The Church in the flesh, like Jesus in the flesh, is subject to the civil power. This is certainly a Scriptural doctrine (Matt. 22: 17-21; Rom. 13: 1-6; Titus 3: 1; 1 Pet. 2: 13-17). One of the reasons that God has subjected the Christ, Head and Body, while in the flesh, to the civil power is that through such obedience they could be all the more thoroughly tested by the things that they would suffer from the civil power incidental to their carrying out their sacrifice as Sin-offerings; for in the vast majority of the cases their being put to death without the camp was ostensibly as rebels against the civil power, which they obeyed faithfully in all things within the sphere of the State's right to command. Only such obedience as conflicted with God's Word did they refuse to render (Acts 5: 29); and even in this they showed a willing obedience to suffer uncomplainingly the consequences of such a course. To the natural man their subjection to the State, with the concomitants of suffering at its hand, seemed sure proof that they were not God's prospective kings and priests; and thus it proved one of the means of hiding the Christ class, as the hidden mystery, from human ken. Thus in two ways the subjection of the Christ class in the flesh to the civil power was connected with them as the mystery of God: (1) to effect a part of their sufferings as Sin-offerings and (2) to hide them as the mystery.

(35) Thus the doctrine that was the stewardship teaching of the Episcopal Church was connected with the Christ class as the special mystery of God, which mystery is the greatest expression of God's wisdom. Hence in the type the tribe of Gad dwelt on the south

of the tabernacle, whose camp had as its standard that which represented God's wisdom; and it is appropriate that the Episcopal Church should take its stand, as for its stewardship truth, on the antitypical South of the antitypical Tabernacle—God's wisdom. Now we are in a better position to see why the south of the tabernacle stood for God's wisdom. The three doctrines championed by the three denominations, antitypical of the three tribes on the south of the tabernacle, center in Christ and the Church as the mystery of God in their office work, *i.e.*, (1) Christ's office work as Jehovah's Special Representative; (2) the office work of the Church as God's representative in the world; and (3) the subjection of the Christ to the civil power in the days of their flesh, bringing in part upon them their sacrificial sufferings, not understood by the world. Thus the Christ, the hidden mystery, as the chief expression of Jehovah's wisdom, is the line of thought championed by the three denominations on the antitypical Tabernacle's South, just as God's wisdom was represented by the standard of the camp on the south of the tabernacle in the type.

(36) The Little Flock member who started the movement which crown-lost leaders perverted into the Episcopal Church, with the doctrinal principle that the Christ, Head and Body, in the flesh, is subject to the civil power, was Thomas Cranmer, who later became the Archbishop of Canterbury, and thus "primate of all England." He was born July 2, 1489, and died at papal hands by fire at the stake on March 21, 1556. He was educated at Cambridge University, where he later became a professor. In 1529 he obtained the favor of Henry VIII by advising that the question of the legality of the latter's marriage with his brother's widow be submitted to the universities of Christendom, to avoid its longer submission to the pope's decision. In the controversy with Rome he held that, not to the pope, but to the king all persons, lay and clerical,

in England were subject, *i.e.*, that the Lord wills that the Church be subject to the civil power, and not that the civil power be subject to the Church, *i.e.*, the pope. His stand on the illegality of Henry's marriage and his authority over all Englishmen, lay or clerical, brought him into violent conflict with the pope, who for year's favored Henry's marriage annulment, but feared the wrath of Charles V, the nephew of Henry's wife, and who therefore temporized on the question. Cranmer boldly claimed that the pope had neither civil nor religious power over England and its inhabitants, that all his claimed powers were usurpations, and that his claims to civil authority over England fundamentally contradicted the teachings that the Church is by God made subject to the civil power, and not vice versa as the pope claimed. In 1533 Cranmer became as Archbishop of Canterbury, all England's primate. In 1535 he abjured allegiance to the pope, was at Henry's death made one of the regents during the minority of Edward VI, was the most influential leader in the Reformation work of what later became the Episcopal Church—the Church of England. Required against his advice and opinion by King Edward VI to sign the patent settling the succession to the throne on Lady Jane Grey, as against Mary and Elizabeth, who were in succession; so nominated by Henry VIII, he was on Mary's accession in 1553 imprisoned on the charge of treason, was for it sentenced to death by beheading, but later was pardoned in order that he might suffer a severer punishment. Thereupon he was charged with heresy for rejecting transubstantiation, was condemned and kept in a filthy prison under grave severities for nearly three years. Weakened in mind and will by his long-drawn-out sufferings in prison, he was, on promise of pardon, induced to sign a mild recantation, which by papal forgeries was elaborated into six; for the story of his signing six recantations, each successive one more stringent than its alleged

predecessor, rests on the sole claim of his persecutor, "bloody Bonner." Left under the impression that after a public recantation he was to be freed, he went to the place where it was to be made—St. Mary's Church at Oxford. But, deeply penitent for his recantation, and knowing that what he was about to do would bring him certain death at the stake, he expressed deep sorrow for his cowardice, solemnly abjured his recantation and said that when he would be burned he would first hold his right hand that had signed the recantation in the fire as a proof of his hearty abjuration of it. Angered to the quick, the papists, who had falsified to him as to his release, and who had from the start intended to burn him, as soon as he had made his public recantation, hurried him to the stake, where he steadfastly held his right hand to the fire, which first consumed it before it much affected the rest of his body, saying that by it he had sinned and by it he would first burn. His burning, together with the burning of his colleagues, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper and Ferrar, all bishops, filled England with a horror that arose to still greater heights as Protestant victim after victim was burned to the number of 286, when, by what seems a Divine judgment, "Bloody Mary," the pope's legate and England's primate, and 14 bishops, the sixteen chief persecutors, died within an incredibly short time of one another, most of them by plague. Then Elizabeth ascended the throne and the persecution ended.

(37) The better to understand the movement that from its Divine side Cranmer aroused on the authoritative relation of the State to the Church, as against the pope's claims and usurpations, it will be well for us to glance briefly at the gradual growth of the papal power in England as it used sometimes fraud, sometimes flattery, sometimes usurpation and sometimes force to establish itself there. England received Churchianity first from churches in France, and not from

Rome, several centuries before Augustine, a monk, in 597, with colaborers was sent there on a mission as the representatives of Gregory I, one of the three greatest popes. Augustine's claim of the pope's authority over the English clergy and laity the British bishops firmly denied as an unheard-of thing, they holding that loyalty to God and their king forbade their subjection to a foreign bishop. It is certain that Alfred the Great, 849-901, exercised authority over all English persons, lay or clerical, while the pope claims in the canon law that the clergy are subject in all things to him alone. And this position of Alfred, with occasional vacillations, was held by practically all kings of England down to Cranmer's times. When Gregory VII—Hildebrand—one of the three greatest popes, sought to obtain fealty from William the Conqueror, 1078, the latter refused it, claiming that this was against all English precedents. The kings claimed the right to nominate all English bishops and archbishops, because these exercised more or less of civil power under the king. William Rufus, the Conqueror's son and successor, not only followed his father's course, but forbade Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his first attempt to appeal to Rome, from so doing, all the bishops and barons joining him in the contention that such a thing was unheard-of in England and contrary to English usage. Henry I, his successor, told the pope that he would not at papal demand relinquish any of the crown's prerogatives to the pope. Further to outlaw appeals to the pope, Henry II, 1164, summoned a council of British nobles and clergy. The earls and barons passed, as the eighth of the Constitutions of Clarendon, a prohibition of any appeals outside of England, the king being the final court.

(38) However, there were sly and gradual encroachments of papal power from the death of William Rufus, 1100, until after the accession of King John, called Lackland, because of his shameful surrender of

his kingdom to Pope Innocent III, the greatest of the three greatest popes, and his receiving it back under shameful conditions as a vassal of the pope. This pope, one of the greatest power-graspers of all times, well knowing that it was a prerogative of the English king to appoint the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1205 took it upon himself to do this by forcing a chapter of monks, fraudulently created by himself for this very purpose, to elect his nominee at Rome, without the king's knowledge. This greatly enraged the king, who on their return impeached these monks for high treason, banished them, seized the estates of the see and chapter of Canterbury for himself and defied the pope, who answered by an interdict, and two years later by anathema. The clergy and laity sided with the pope. After much strife, the pope commanded Philip Augustus, King of France, to take possession of England as his own kingdom. A crusade against the excommunicated king was ordered by the pope, at the hands of the French king. John finally surrendered unconditionally to the pope, securing his kingdom back as a vassal of the pope, May 15, 1213. That autumn the pope's legate forced John to renew the surrender. The primate of England, Steven Langton, and the barons, seeing that the ancient liberties of England, clerical and lay, were being destroyed by the pope, resisted John as his representative and forced from him the Magna Carta, the first charter of liberty, which guaranteed to every order in England its ancient liberties, and some fresh ones, and which the papal tyrant, Innocent III, declared void. Innocent's usurpations were for some time maintained despite English objections. Henry III, from 1216 to 1272, let the pope's usurpations in State and Church have free course and abound in England. The next king, Edward I, 1272 to 1307, by the people's co-operation in making laws, hindered the clergy from getting land so freely as they had, especially by fear-enforced bequests; though

through evasion of the law—the statute of Mortmain—they by the times of Henry VIII gained possession of very large parts of English property. Edward I, with Parliament's help, refused subjection to Boniface VIII, another very powerful and power-grasping pope. In the reign of Edward III Parliament declared null and void the grant of the kingdom to the pope. In the reign of Richard II, 1377 to 1399, the Statute of Praemunire was enacted, which prohibited all appeals to powers outside of England. On the accession of Henry IV, the pope and all other foreign princes were forbidden to meddle in England's affairs. During the reign of Henry VI, 1422 to 1461, England successfully resisted the pope's efforts to make void the Statute of Praemunire. In the reign of Edward IV, 1461 to 1483, it was forbidden any cleric to sue another cleric in the pope's court. While in these struggles the pope's claims were often acceded to by the private acts of ministers and counselors or weak monarchs, never was even one of their usurpations legalized by statute; but, on the contrary, every one of them was in time resisted and declared by statute as criminal. This proves that the doctrine of the Royal supremacy was not invented at the time of the Reformation, as papists claim; but that at that time, as in times past, it was used in fighting the claims of papal supremacy in State and Church, which almost always the papal English clergy claimed as against the Royal supremacy.

(39) Cranmer was led to announce that contrary to papal claims, according to God's law, all clerics as well as laymen are subject to the civil power. He did not teach that the king under God was the head of the Church of England, as the king claimed, though he had to put up with this doctrine, but that Christ only was the Head of the Church, which implied that the pope was not the head of the Church, and that all were nevertheless obligated by the Scriptures to obey the king. This struck a fatal blow at the papal doctrine

of the pope's supremacy over all people, clerical and lay, and his doctrine that clerics are not amenable to the laws of the State, but to the canon law—the pope's law—alone. Cranmer contended that the Statute of Provisors (which forbade clerics to accept appointment from foreigners, or to pay certain fees to foreigners for such appointment, which consequently prevented the pope from appointing to office in the English Church and from deriving certain revenues therefrom) and the Statute of Praemunire (which forbade appeals to courts outside of England) were just and Scriptural in respect to the powers of the State in relation to the Church. He taught that the pope's doctrine on these matters violently contradicted the Scriptures and resulted in robbing the English king, nobles, clergy and people of their rights, powers, honor and wealth. Such teaching pierced as with a knife the very heart of the papacy's purposes, which have always been lust for honor, power, dominion and wealth. Over 150 years before Cranmer, Wyclif, with greater ability, but in less favorable times, set forth the same teachings; but his was the time of Reformation by individuals, while Cranmer fell on times when the Reformation by sects was due. Hence the difference in the results of the teachings of each of these reformers.

(40) There was a variety of causes leading up to Cranmer's teaching on this subject. First was the venial course of the pope (who, favoring the marriage annulment, was in fear of Charles V holding back his decision for a more favorable time) in delaying the declaration of the invalidity of Henry VIII's marriage with his brother's widow, a thing against which the latter protested at the time of the espousal's being forced on him by his father—a thing that both the Bible (Lev. 18: 16, 6-18; comp. 1 Cor. 5: 1) and the canon law forbade, but for which a venial pope, Julius II, had granted a dispensation, and a thing that leading Universities of Christendom declared was beyond

the power of a pope to validate, since it implied that a pope could set aside God's law. Cranmer advised Henry VIII that, not only God's law, but the laws of his own land required the dissolution of an incestuous marriage, and that the English civil and clerical courts had all the authority necessary in the premises. The pope denied this claim. Cranmer answered that marriage, being a secular thing, was a matter under the control of the State, not under the control of the Church; and this led him to emphasize the subjection of the Church to the State as a clear teaching of God's law. Second, Cranmer was led to announce this teaching by the pope's claim of control over the State by the Church, *i.e.*, by the pope, and the direct subjection of all the clergy in all things to the pope, and the direct subjection of the laity in spiritual matters to the pope, and the indirect subjection of the laity in secular things to him through the subjection of their rulers to him. All of this Cranmer rejected, because it contradicts the Scripture on the subjection of every soul to the higher [civil] powers. The third thing that led Cranmer to announce this teaching was Rome's despoiling England of its national honor, liberties and wealth, in an alleged subjection of England to the pope.

(41) The circumstances of the times made the movement aroused by Cranmer's teaching on this subject nation-wide, yea, world-wide ultimately. The condition of the king, the clergy, the nobility and the common people of England, made this doctrine just the one needed to give the pope the next hardest blow delivered him during the Reformation, Luther's blow being the only harder one. The English people almost to a man rallied to this doctrine, stood manfully by its implications and defended it successfully against the power of the pope and popish States in storm and stress such as seldom have tried men's souls. The excesses of Henry VIII in other respects, the mistakes

and weaknesses of Cranmer in some matters and the wrongs of others who co-operated, cannot militate against the Divine origin of the movement which Cranmer instrumentally inaugurated, and which antitypes Jacob's begetting Gad of Zilpah. The movement grew and abounded until it extirpated in England every product of the papal doctrine of the subjection of the State to the Church. And overflowing the home of its birth, the movement has spread through Christendom until every Christian nation has rejected the papal doctrine of the subjection of the State to the Church, and has made to prevail more or less that doctrine which Cranmer announced as Biblical on the subject.

(42) We now meet with a phenomenon which in the case of the Christian and Adventist Churches was present, but which was not particularly brought out, and which we will meet in the case of most other Protestant denominations, *i.e.*, the one—Cranmer—who started the movement that was later perverted into the Episcopal Church co-operated with crown-lost leaders in acts tending to pervert that movement into a sectarian system. Those Little Flock brethren who started Little Flock movements and later cooperated with crown-lost leaders in perverting them into denominations and as such served them, are in such activity typed by captive and blinded Samson grinding out the grain for the Philistines. This same phenomenon, as parts of the same antitypes, we witness especially in Luther, Hubmaier, Wesley, Stone and Miller. It was rather faint in Zwingli, and almost entirely absent in Servetus. Most of Cranmer's mistakes, which the papists and some secular historians have very grossly exaggerated, *e.g.*, exaggerating his one signed recantation into six, each succeeding fraudulent one being made more glaring and abject than its predecessor, were committed while unawares (typed by Samson's blindness) he was serving sectarianism. Next to Luther, Cranmer, of all Protestant Reformers,

has been the object of papacy's most venomous and mendacious attacks. This at least proves that next to Luther he delivered to Rome the most devastating blow. Luther's attack dealt the main death blow to Rome's doctrinal power over the people; Cranmer's attack dealt the main death blow to Rome's political power over the nations. We miss in Cranmer the natural genius, religious depth, heedless straightforwardness, genial companionableness and defiant heroism that made Luther one of the twenty greatest men of history. But in Luther we miss the tact and teamwork ability that characterized Cranmer. Each in his own sphere was a noble and efficient instrument of the Lord to forward his own peculiar work. Luther could no more have done Cranmer's work as a subject of Henry VIII than Cranmer could have done Luther's work as a subject of Charles V. Let us thank God for the distinct, yet complementary, work of each of these great servants of God!

(43) The main crown-lost leaders who perverted the movement inaugurated by Cranmer into or kept it as the Episcopal Church, are Queen Elizabeth, Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Hooker, Taylor and Barrow, though previously Cranmer and other Little Flock leaders, like Ridley, Latimer, Ferrar and Hooper, all bishops, and all burned for their faith by "Bloody Mary" at the stake, had done considerable toward sectarianizing Cranmer's movement toward the Episcopal Church. Under Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury after the end of the Catholic restoration under "Bloody Mary," the Episcopal Church received its present creed, the 39 articles, which were confirmed by Convocation in 1562 and legalized as a fundamental statute by Parliament in 1572. Thus the Episcopal Church was set up by law, receiving an Episcopal constitution with apostolic succession as its doctrinal basis, under the Royal supremacy, as the established Church. Its sectarian character received greater development later,

especially through the writings of Hooker and the administration of Whitgift as primates. They receded from Cranmer's position that the Royal supremacy meant that the king had authority over both laymen and clerics, to the position of Henry VIII, which Cranmer had to suffer, but did not endorse, to the effect that under God the ruler was the Head or Governor, *i.e.*, ruler of the Church, as well as of clerics and laymen—quite a distinction. This in effect made the English ruler the pope of England. The crown-lost leaders introduced many other errors. But on one thing they stood firm—that the civil power is over all laymen and clerics, and that the Church is subject to, not the ruler over, the civil power; and by their defending and applying this doctrine they offered antitypical Eliasaph's charger, bowl and spoon. And such activity, combined with the excess of power that they ascribed to the civil ruler, is typed in the meaning of the names Eliasaph (increase [beyond what is due] of power) and Deuel (acknowledgment of power).

(44) While Cranmer's movement was yet in operation as such, *i.e.*, before the crown-lost leaders perverted it into the Episcopal Church, a great controversy was waged over Henry VIII's taking over, at Cranmer's advice, the authority over all clerics and cutting off the pope from all authority whatsoever in England. The pope's subserviency against his own convictions to Charles V on the question of the validity of Henry's marriage and his years' long-drawn-out temporizing on the matter thoroughly disgusted Henry. The papal acts in violation of the ancient Statutes of Provisors and Praemunire angered Henry still more: The clergy's and monks' violations of the Statute of Mortmain made him furious. At Cranmer's advice be determined to enforce, and did enforce, these three laws, which precipitated him into an intense warfare with the pope. All England sided with Henry, who thus stripped the pope of all power over the English

Church and State; and, against Cranmer's views, which he could not emphasize, because he considered himself bound to obey the king as supreme, Henry in effect made himself pope in England. Henry was guilty of much wrong, which, however, cannot be saddled upon Protestantism, as partisan papists never weary of doing; for despite his rejecting the pope's authority, political and spiritual, in England, he lived and died a Catholic in doctrine, and killed many Protestant martyrs in his efforts to prevent the entrance of Protestantism into England; though he doubtless prepared the soil for Protestantism by his rejection of the pope's supremacy in Church and State.

(45) Greatly angered at Henry's course, Pope Paul III already in Aug., 1535, prepared a bull for Henry's excommunication from the Church and deposition from his throne; but friendly European sovereigns succeeded in dissuading the pope from publishing the bull until 1538. In August, 1538, however, the pope, despite the protests of European sovereigns, published it. This pope as cardinal had been one of the most zealous members of the papal court, which was almost unanimously in Henry's favor, in urging his predecessor to declare Henry's and Catharine's marriage null and void from the outstart, as against Scripture and canon law. Now as pope he pretended that Henry's course toward Catharine was the chief reason for his anathematization and (attempted) deposition of Henry, well knowing that it was Henry's rejection of his usurpations on England's liberties, power and wealth, and finally of all his claims to authority in England's State or Church, that made him curse Henry and order his deposition.

(46) We will state the main contents of this bull, which had 22 sections, that our readers may see what modern popes would do, if they could. After a preamble setting forth the pope's claim as Christ's vicegerent to be over Church and State in Christendom,

he sets forth in sections 1-3 Henry's alleged offenses. Section 4 exhorts Henry and his party to desist from and undo his alleged wrongs. Section 5 forbids all to support him; section 6 anathematizes all impenitent in this matter; section 7 charges his supporters with rebellion, declares the forfeiture of Henry's kingdom, cites all to appear before various tribunals within certain times, and cites Henry in person or representative to appear at the Roman Court within 90 days, failing in which things excommunication unto damnation would set in at the end of three days following. Section 8 puts the interdict on England (which forbade all public religious services, sacraments, masses, etc., commanded all Catholic clerics, with certain few exceptions, to leave England; in other words, let the kingdom, with few exceptions, deprived of the grace of God from the pope's standpoint, go to the devil unto damnation). Section 9 disinherits Henry's children and all his supporters and deprives them of all previous privileges, even of citizenship, declaring them infamous. Section 10 absolves all subjects of England from their oath of allegiance to the king and his supporters and commands them to sever themselves from all relations with them. Section 11 declares their forfeiture of all legal rights, even of the right to be witnesses in court, of making bequests or of executing any other legal paper, of owning property, etc. Section 12 forbids all dealings of whatever kind with them—an absolute boycott. Section 13 forbids all conversation with them by the clergy and monks on pain of excommunication and deprivation, and again commands all but a few of these to leave England. Section 14 calls upon all Englishmen, by promise of possession of all seized properties, to arise in rebellion and drive Henry and his supporters out of authority and out of the kingdom, and forbids under above penalties all to fight for them. Section 15 calls on the princes of Christendom to invade England and take

it from Henry and cancels all their treaties with, and obligations to Henry. Section 16 commands all soldiers and (naval) sailors to take up arms against Henry and his supporters and to seize for their own possession all their property, including such as may be in foreign lands. Section 17 confirms the captors in the possession of their seizures and charges them *to make slaves of their captives*, and forbids their supplying food to Henry and his supporters. Section 18 orders all the clergy of all orders and all monks on pain of excommunication and deprivation within three days to pronounce with cross, bell and candle the anathema on Henry and his supporters as publicly as possible, and to affix the bull on the churches and monasteries. Section 19 pronounces the same penalties on all impeding such publicity and upon all state officials who will not further such publicity. Section 20 claims that Henry and his supporters would have sufficient knowledge of the publication of this bull, if it were affixed to certain mentioned churches—all outside of England, which affixture the section authorizes. Section 21 sanctions for notification purposes any copy of the bull signed by a notary and a prelate. Section 22 forbids anyone from infringing or contradicting the bull on pain of angering Almighty God and Sts. Peter and Paul. Aug. 30, 1535, is given as the date of the bull in its last sentence, though as said above, pressure from European sovereigns prevented its publication for three years—until August, 1538.

(47) This bull in many respects is a remarkable one, even among the more remarkable of papal bulls. Above all it is remarkable for what it reveals of papal hypocrisy, pride, affrontery, usurpatoriness, brazenness, mischievousness, wickedness, recklessness, arbitrariness, lawlessness, folly, lovelessness, cruelty, implacability and reprobativeness. The mere reading of that bull should convince every law-abiding and liberty-loving person of the unmitigated impossibility of the

papal Antichrist. Let us remember that such a bull is infallible, according to papal doctrines; for it was addressed to all Christendom *ex cathedra.* Let us also remember that the modern popes hold the same sentiments, *e.g.*, toward anti-Catholic French, German and Mexican statesmen, but do not declare them, because they lack the power of even an attempted enforcement, which they did not lack in Henry's day. Supported by his people Henry forbade as high treason the introduction or publication of the bull in his dominions. He retaliated by a partial spoliation of papal and monastic property, acquired by clerical and monastic evasion of the Statute of Mortmain, and used part of the proceeds to equip the army, navy and his fortresses, to resist the threatened invasions aroused by the papal bull. Cranmer and his colleagues by Scripture and history demolished the entire foundation upon which the pretensions underlying the bull were based; and papal legates and other papal representatives were no more seen in England until after 15 years, when Mary, Henry's daughter by Catharine, mounted the English throne, and by reintroducing papacy and papal methods and by fiendishly murdering saints and martyrs of Jesus deservedly inherited the epithet "bloody" as belonging to her name—"Bloody Mary." She claimed to be God's favorite on earth, on the ground that she was more like Him than anyone else, since, she alleged, God tormented heretics eternally, and she tormented them all she could!

(48) Antitypical Eliasaph offered his charger—correction of misconduct toward the civil power, especially in acts based upon the error that the Church is not subject to the civil power, but vice versa. He rebuked those English Catholics who accepted benefices from the pope and paid him certain fees, their first year's income, annual taxes, etc., as violating the law of the land. He rebuked those Catholics who in Elizabeth's day gave obedience to the pope rather than to

their queen. He rebuked the Catholics for harboring the Jesuits and Catholic priests—"Seminary priests"—who, as the pope's emissaries seeking to stir up a revolt against Elizabeth, were forbidden the land. He corrected the misconduct of those who intrigued with Mary, Queen of Scots, to lead a revolt in order to gain Elizabeth's throne. He rebuked the conduct of the Jesuits and priests who surreptitiously entered the land contrary to law and sought to stir up a rebellion against the State. He rebuked papal plotters on the queen's life. He rebuked the pope for his declaring Elizabeth a usurper, a slave of wickedness, and a fraudulent holder of the English throne. He rebuked his declaring the forfeiture of her throne, absolving her subjects from their oath of allegiance and calling upon them to dethrone, dispossess and drive her from England. He reproved him for calling upon the Catholic nations to make a crusade against her and take possession of England as their own territory. He rebuked him for stirring up Philip of Spain to send the Spanish Armada against England, and for attempting to incite Scotland and France to war on England. He rebuked him as a violator of God's laws as to rulers and people, which require all Christians to obey their rulers, which in England he forbade, which require all Christians to honor their rulers, which in England he forbade, which require all Christians to pray for their rulers, which in England he forbade, and which require all Christians to support their rulers, which in England he forbade. He rebuked the conduct of those nobles and common people who failed to obey, honor, pray for and support their rulers, as well as those who disobeyed, dishonored, prayed against and opposed their rulers. In short, every breach of conduct against the rulers coming from clerical or lay people, from nobles or common people and from natives or foreigners he rebuked as sin against God's law as to the relation of the State and Church, and rulers and subjects.

In so doing he offered antitypical Eliasaph's charger.

(49) Before writing of antitypical Eliasaph's bowl it would be helpful to consider one of the main sets of affairs which first occasioned its offering—the events of Elizabeth's reign as related to the Catholic attempts to overthrow her and restore Catholicism to the throne. Elizabeth amid the extremely hard conditions in which she was placed proved herself one of the very ablest and most successful rulers that ever occupied a throne. While there were not a few things in her that came far sort of highest Christian ideals, she was a good woman, as well as a very remarkable ruler. Her tactfulness and management of affairs amid greatest difficulties were of the highest order; and she had the wisdom to select and keep with her some of the ablest ministers (particularly Cecil) of England's long history—and this means some of the ablest statesmen of all times; for the English undoubtedly excel all others in statesmanship. Remembering that at Elizabeth's accession, 1558, England was by law under the papacy, an evil which "Bloody Mary" had reintroduced, and that all the clergy, and almost all the nobility and people were Romanists, the difficulties of her position may be readily visualized. Extreme tact was required on her part as a Protestant at heart, though outwardly constrained to conform to the papacy by "Bloody Mary," when she came into power. Acting on Cecil's advice, for some time she made not the slightest changes; then slowly and by degrees she let her stand be known, and that not by word, but by enactments. She first had an act passed restoring to the crown its ancient jurisdiction in State and Church and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same, with affixed penalties in case of disobedience, *i.e.*, repealed the laws that Mary had passed repealing all anti-Roman laws, particularly those of the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. This legislation of Elizabeth's destroyed again the pope's temporal and spiritual

power in England at one blow. She required the clergy to obey this law, and dismissed from office all who refused. This law made no doctrinal change. By another act the Church service, with some minor changes, adopted by Edward VI was reintroduced, which abolished the Latin Romish service. Later by the act of Uniformity the people were allowed freedom of faith, but not of worship—all had, under penalties, to attend the services of the State Church. Elizabeth never forced any Catholics on matters of faith, but did on matters of worship; but there were no Romish martyrs in her days as there had been Protestant martyrs in Mary's days. Her whole course; however, was in favor of the Episcopal Church, which she had established as the State Church. And gradually the laity was weaned away from the Roman creed until, by the end of her 45 years' reign, almost all England was Protestant in faith.

(50) Repeatedly the popes sought to win her away from Protestantism to them and their ways. These advances she met with her usual tact that gave the popes just enough hope to hold them back from interfering with the loyalty of Elizabeth's Catholic subjects, she using these respites with good effect to the strengthening of her position in England. Beset at home and abroad with difficulties that would have crushed the average great man, Elizabeth with consummate tact and wonderful success pursued her course. In turn she wrought, she staid, she suffered with almost superhuman tact, as occasion demanded, that her beloved subjects might be furthered. As queen and woman she certainly sacrificed herself for her people. And her devotion to their interests won their ever increasing love for her to a degree that few rulers ever enjoyed the love of their subjects. But few Englishmen of her day that would not have counted it a joy to die for her. To this day she, with Alfred the Great, is probably England's most loved and honored

sovereign, as in her day the strong love of her people prompted them to call her "good Queen Bess." And she lifted England from a low rated power to the foremost rank among European nations. The period of her reign is all in all probably the greatest in all England's history. By her tact she held back three successive popes' open opposition for nearly 12 years, until the third saw that they had been completely outwitted throughout that period by her tactfulness, in winning most of her subjects from Romanism to Episcopalian Protestantism.

(51) In 1570 Pope Pius V caused the papal artillery to thunder forth a bombardment in the form of a bull on her condemnation and excommunication. We will give a summary of this bull also: The preamble sets forth the papal claim to sovereignty over the Church and all nations, on account of which the action of the bull is undertaken. Section 1, calling Elizabeth "the pretended Queen of England," accuses her of usurping England's throne and headship of its Church and of being chiefly responsible for England's second forsaking of the pope. Section 2 charges her with uprooting Mary's work, with heresy, abasing Catholics, elevating Protestants, abolishing Catholic doctrines, practices and organizations, substituting Protestant ones, hindering and prohibiting Catholicism, furthering Protestantism, shutting papacy out of England, persecuting its adherents, requiring acknowledgment of her supremacy, etc. Section 3, declaring her irreformable, and therefore amenable to papal punishments, pronounces anathema upon her. Section 4 declares the forfeiture of her kingdom and all dominion, dignity and privilege whatsoever. Section 5 absolves all her subjects from their oath of allegiance and obedience, and prohibits all from obeying her on pain of anathema. Section 6 declares equally authoritative with the original bull any notarized copy of the bull signed by

a prelate or his court. The bull closes with the statement of its date, May 5, 1570.

(52) At the issuance of this bull most Englishmen rallied to their queen. Parliament legislated that it was high treason in an Englishmen to attempt to enforce any part of the bull or in consequence of it to act against the queen or the country, and also forbade its importation or any other "writings, instruments and other superstitious things of the See of Rome." Some of her Catholic subjects, induced thereto by their "faith," sought to assassinate her. These, when apprehended, were beheaded for treason, Rome falsely calling them martyrs. Some of them, for the same reason, intrigued with Mary, Queen of Scots, then in England, to kill Elizabeth. These, likewise, as well as Mary, were beheaded for treason, Rome falsely calling them martyrs. Some Jesuits, notably the Englishman, Campion, and some priests, seeking to arouse the Catholics to revolt, were likewise beheaded as traitors, Rome again falsely calling them martyrs. Their death for treason Rome misrepresents as persecution for their "faith." Their faith made them traitors by their intended assassinations and revolutions. Had they been executed for heresy, the law would have required their burning. This one fact disproves the papal claim of religious persecution. They were executed for crimes against the State and its head, not for their religion as distinct from political treason. The Roman plea proves their faith to incite its believers to assassination and rebellion—in England to treason. There was a fair-sized body of Catholics who were ready to rise in rebellion, and they actually did so; but they were defeated, their leaders executed for treason; and that ended the affair. The instigators were Jesuits and "Seminary priests," who were ordered to leave the realm within 40 days, unless they would swear to the queen's supremacy.

(53) For various reasons the Catholic monarchs of

Europe delayed for 18 years invading England at papal instigation to overthrow Elizabeth and possess the country for Rome. But after six Catholics (who with Mary, Queen of Scots, plotted, at the direct instigation of the pope; the murder of Elizabeth) were with Mary executed for treason—all six confessing their purpose to murder the Queen, the pope became insistent on the invasion of England. Philip II of Spain, "Bloody Mary's" widower, consented to undertake the enterprise. He arranged for the Duke of Parma, the ablest general of the day, to bring an army of 40,000 in the Netherlands to a suitable embarking place. He then prepared 132 large warships, an immense fleet for those days, called the Invincible Armada, for the invasion. It was to sail from Spain up the Channel, embark Parma's troops, and then sail for England and the Thames, where they were to land and begin the work of bringing back England by force to the pope. All England arose to the occasion. Huge contributions of money and ships were made to the queen for the national defense. Almost every Englishman volunteered for the fleet or army. About 100,000 picked soldiers, all eager to do, to dare and to die for their queen, were accepted and trained for the army, and a considerably smaller number for the navy. The queen's appearance on horse among the soldiers, and her address to them, raised their enthusiasm and determination to the highest pitch. The Spanish preparations were so great that the pope, feeling sure of success, appointed as the primate of England, Father Allen, a fugitive English priest, the head of an English seminary in France where the seminary priests were trained, and a chief instigator of Catholics against Elizabeth. He also sent 600 priests, monks and Jesuits and their attendants with the Armada to take suitable possession of the English churches. The pope blessed the Armada and the whole enterprise. Special prayers were made by the priests throughout Europe to God for five things—

to avert storms, to grant victory, to make foolish the English plans, to make the Catholic plans wise and to restore England to the pope. And the very opposite of each of these five things occurred. The English fleet was decidedly inferior in strength to the Spanish, but was decidedly better officered and manned than the Armada. In late July, 1588, the Armada came up the English Channel. The English fleet, slipping out of Plymouth harbor at night, took a position west of the Spanish fleet, with a sharp wind coming from the west. This made the sides of the British ships toward the Spaniards lie low in the water and the sides of the Spanish ships toward the English stand high above the water. Moreover the wind prevented the Spaniards from approaching the English, while the latter could move as they pleased. The result was that the Spanish fire went high above the English ships, while the latter had splendid targets in the former's ships. To the Spanish came a most unexpected and humiliating defeat. They withdrew from the battle, driven eastward by a storm. The British pursuing, sunk some and took other Spanish ships. Aug. 7, the Spanish fleet cast anchor off Boulogne, France, the British fleet pursuing, being but two or three miles in the rear. That night the latter loaded 8 ships with all the inflammable material at hand and, towing them very near to the anchored enemy, set them on fire and drove them among the Spanish ships. Consternation seized the Spaniards, their ships fled in great disorder in all directions to escape the fire and were pursued by the English, who destroyed and captured many Spanish ships. The English kept up the pursuit until they had exhausted their ammunition. So demoralized were the Spaniards that they decided to return to Spain; but the English ships and a storm prevented their going down the Channel directly home. So they sailed northward around Scotland and Ireland; but storms pursued and dispersed them and destroyed most of them. Only 54 shattered ships out of the 134,

and only 10,000 disheartened and exhausted men out of the 31,000 reached Spain (most of the 10,000 dying shortly thereafter), leaving Parma bottled up in the Netherlands by the English fleet. England ascribed the victory to God, striking a medal on which were inscribed the Psalmist's words, "He sent His winds and scattered them."

(54) A few years later another Armada was sent by Philip, which met an almost like fate. In the end Elizabeth won and papacy failed. We might speak of further popish plots against the English civil power, *e.g.*, the gunpowder plot, whereby they sought to blow up at the opening of Parliament the whole royal family, the whole British nobility, Commons and all the visiting local officials, *i.e.*, destroy almost every influential English man and woman; also the efforts of Charles II, and more especially James II, to reintroduce papacy to the undoing of the civil power, all of which was frustrated by the vigilant and liberty-loving English. In these matters we have set forth papacy's efforts to overthrow the State and rulers whom it could not control. All of this was in violation of God's law (Rom. 13: 1-6; etc.)—"let *every* soul be subject to the higher powers." It was amid, and occasioned by these events that antitypical Eliasaph in large part offered his bowl—refutative teachings—against those who in the interests of the pope's supremacy denied the State's authority over all citizens; and it is precisely for this reason that we have given so much of the history of these conflicts. Romanist theologians have sought, on the basis of the pope's alleged rulership over all nations as Christ's vicar, to vindicate their pope's course toward civil rulers who have thrown off the pope's yoke. But antitypical Eliasaph met and refuted their every argument. His three ablest representatives on this refutative line were Jeremy Taylor, Isaac Barrows and Richard Hooker, who form the trio of antitypical Eliasaph's ablest representatives. To this day Barrow's

book entitled, "A Treatise On The Pope's Supremacy," remains the classic on that subject, and is a most overwhelming and unanswerable refutation of the errors of the papacy on its supremacy in Church and State, as against the Scriptural teaching that *every* soul is to be subject to the higher power, *i.e.*, to civil authority. From Scripture, reason and history, antitypical Eliasaph attacked and refuted the seven propositions by which papacy seeks to prove its claims to supremacy over Church and State as Christ's vicar. The seven propositions are these: (1) St. Peter had a primacy over the other Apostles; (2) St. Peter's primacy, with its rights and prerogatives, was not personal, but derivable to his successors; (3) St. Peter was bishop of Rome; (4) St. Peter continued bishop of Rome after his death, and was so at his decease; (5) the bishops of Rome (according to God's institution and by original right derived thence) should have a universal supremacy and jurisdiction over the Church and State; (6) the Roman bishops continually from St. Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this sovereign power over the Church and from later centuries onward over the State; and (7) this power is indefectible and unalterable according to Divine intention.

(55) As to the first proposition, antitypical Eliasaph conceded that Peter among the original twelve had a primacy of talent, personal excellence, zeal, reputation, time of appointment to apostleship (Matt: 10: 2) and of certain services; but he denied totally that he had a primacy of supremacy and jurisdiction over the other Apostles: (1) because the Scriptures nowhere teach it; (2) because the passages (Matt. 16: 17-19; Luke 22: 31, 32; John 21: 15-17) which the papacy interpreted for its supremacy give no such thought; (3) because the Scriptures disapproved and forbade such a primacy among the Apostles (Acts 10: 25, 26; Matt. 18: 18; 20: 2-28; 23: 8, Luke 22: 24-30; Rev. 21: 14; John 21: 20-22; Eph. 2: 19-21; 1 Pet. 5: 1-3); (4)

because if such a primacy of St. Peter had been intended it would have been clearly stated in the Scriptures; (5) because there is no Scriptural example of St. Peter's exercising such a primacy over the Apostles and the Church, let alone over the State; (6) because such a primacy of St. Peter would contradict Christ's headship over the Church and the Apostles and the office of the Spirit as Christ's representative in the Church; and (7) because there was no such doctrine taught or practiced in the first centuries after the Apostles. Antitypical Eliasaph used other arguments than these against the first proposition on papal supremacy; but these were his chief ones and with their proof the disproof of the other six papal supremacy propositions follows as a matter of course. Additionally, they offered other refutations to the other six propositions. By the silence of the Scriptures and of the first centuries following the Apostles they denied that Scripturally or traditionally St. Peter was to have a successor in his alleged supremacy. Had antitypical Eliasaph himself not been in the error of Apostolic succession, he would have denied from the Bible's silence on the subject that Scripturally St. Peter or any other Apostle was to have a successor of any kind. From the silence of the Scriptures and of the first and second centuries he showed that it could not be proved that St. Peter was ever in Rome, let alone was the bishop of the Roman Church. He contended that had St. Peter had such an office there, St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, and Luke in the Acts in connection with Paul's stay there, would certainly have made an allusion to it, while writing to or of the Roman brethren. He also contended that St. Peter being made the special Apostle of the Jews and St. Paul being made that of the Gentiles, disprove St. Peter's so-called Roman bishopric. Further, he showed that only in the third century did the fertile imagination of the rising

Antichrist invent the story of St. Peter's bishopric in Rome, and that later this was elaborated into such a bishopric for 25 years preceding his death! The only evidence, he taught, for the fourth proposition was the baseless claims of the popes and their advocates; for he showed that neither Scripture nor authentic history proves it or alludes to it. The fifth proposition he showed has not the slightest Scriptural, reasonable or authentic historic basis. He proved that the Roman bishop gradually grew into his power over a period of many centuries by all sorts of propitious events, frauds, usurpations, support from various kings, etc., who in their contentions, needing the pope's favor, in turn granted favors, powers, territories, etc., to him. Antitypical Eliasaph denied totally the truthfulness of the sixth proposition and gave numberless facts to show that the Roman bishop in the first centuries of the Church did not exercise supremacy over the whole Church, nor that he has always done so even over the whole Western Church since the first centuries. From the disproof of the preceding six propositions, nothing can be said in defense of the seventh.

(56) By disproving the papal supremacy in the Church, antitypical Eliasaph, of course, disproved it in the State. He further disproved papal arguments for the pope's authority over all civil power by proving that it was never claimed as a power in the Church until long after the pope got civil power in the sixth century; that the pope's temporal power was gotten by quiet usurpation, favorable circumstances and the favor of compliant and necessitous princes; that, *e.g.*, the pope was in truth a vassal of Charlemagne; that in the ninth century, through the now papally admitted fraudulent Isodorian decretals and Constantinian donation (the latter first hinted at in 788 in a letter of Pope Hadrian I to Charlemagne), the absolute supremacy of the pope as Christ's vicar over the

Western nations was set forth as an ancient doctrine; that it remained until the days of Hildebrand in the eleventh century for this claim to be elaborated dogmatically as of world-wide application; and that it remained until the days of Innocent III in the thirteenth century for it to be put into almost universal practice. Thus antitypical Eliasaph proved that both phases of the papal supremacy were matters of centuries long growth, and not of Scriptural origin. Thus its Scripturalness was destroyed. He also showed in many ways its repugnance to reason and natural right. Furthermore, he proved from the teachings and example of Christ, the Apostles and the early Church, that the Head and members of the Church were while in the flesh to be subject to the civil power. In an earlier part of this chapter we cited the pertinent passages and will not, therefore, cite them here. Thus antitypical Eliasaph offered his bowl.

(57) So, too, did he offer his spoon, *i.e.*, ethical teaching—instruction in righteousness, on his line of teaching. He showed how the worst tyranny in the State was better than anarchy; and therefore God's people were by the benefits received from the worst governments obligated to obey its laws which did not command violation of Scripture—in which case they were obediently to suffer its penalties as parts of their suffering for righteousness. He showed that such a course of obedience would cultivate self-denial, order, peace, contentment, faith, hope, love, meekness, faithfulness and strength of character. He showed that it would help others in these lines, and would ultimately commend the Lord's Word to froward officials. He showed that in all this the Lord's people would be advancing their hearts and minds in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service, as their preparation for the kingdom. Thus he used this teaching to further righteousness. Thereby he has advanced political peace, contentment and prosperity; and in

this did much good, especially in Great Britain, in its dependencies and in America, and accordingly offered his spoon.

(1) What so far have we studied in Num. 7? Give a summary of these studies. To what tribes did the three princes belong whose offerings are next to be studied? On what side of the tabernacle were these? What is the name of the prince of Reuben? What do the names *Elizur* and *Shedeur* mean? Whom did the tribe of Reuben type? What does Jacob begetting Reuben type? To what was it perverted? By whom? What was this denomination first called? Whom did it embrace? Why and when was its name changed? What two great errors has the Greek Catholic Church invented and taught? What can these errors not be? What phenomenon is thus manifested in the Greek Catholic Church? What similar phenomena are present in the Presbyterian, Christian and Adventist Churches? What doctrines respectively should each of these Churches mainly have stressed?

(2) What was the doctrine Divinely committed as a stewardship to the Greek Catholic Church? In what three conditions was Jesus God's Special Representative? Who was the Little Flock leader who gave the impetus to the movement centering in Christ's office? When did he produce his writings? How and in what passages did he stress Christ's pre-human office? Human office? Post-human office? What five special errors called for such teachings from John? Name and describe two of John's colaborers in such teaching.

(3) Why was no cup offered in the type as typical of the work of antitypical Elizur? In whose cases does the same thing apply? Why does the name *Elizur* typically suggest the crown-lost leaders of the Greek Catholic Church? What is Christ in His office? Of what is He the chief part? What is Christ in His office to the world? How is this fact typically set forth in the name of Elizur's father as to the crown-lost leaders in the Greek Church? For what Divine quality did the camp to the tabernacle south stand? What is typed by this fact? How does the Greek Catholic Church stand for this quality? What evil thing did its crown-lost leaders do? By what did they do it? By whom and through what was

the first great error on the Logos introduced? To what truth on the Logos did he hold? By whom and through what were two other errors on the Logos introduced? By and against whom were these three great errors championed? Despite these errors what did antitypical Elizur offer?

(4) As what kind of a means did antitypical Elizur minister the doctrine of the pre-human, human and post-human office of Christ? Of what was this the antitype? How did they use its pre-human aspect to rebuke and correct disobedience? Heresy? How did they use His carnation to rebuke and correct power-grasping and self-exaltation? Its human aspect to correct succumbing under temptation? Self-indulgence? Pride? To make sin appear hateful? To correct self-exaltation apart from God's ways? Impenitence? Despising Christ's present ministry? Error, sin, selfishness and worldliness?

(5) What did such teachings effect? What had centuries of heathendom effected in the human family? Where did the Greek Church work? Of what was there need? What did such teaching do with immortality? Infanticide? Exposure of the aged and the weak and deformed infants? The treatment of wives and slaves? Parental tyranny? Exploitation of the poor? Popular blood-thirstiness? Crimes of the arena? Torture? Social vice? Business dishonesty? Enmities? Debauchery? Disregard for life? Cruelty? Poverty? Profanity? Conjugal infidelity? Slander and false-witnessing? Plundering and over-reaching one's neighbor? In effecting these things what did antitypical Elizur do?

(6) What else did he offer? What does a bowl type? What did Satan do as to our Lord's office in its threefold forms? What evil did antitypical Elizur sometimes commit in counteracting these Satanic attacks? What did this evil effect? What did he do to these attacks? When was the first of these attacks decidedly made? By whom? In what form? To what did their error lead them under antitypical Elizur's attacks? What forced them to this? When was the next decided attack launched against our Lord's pre-human office? By whom? What cowardly thing did he do? What did he teach on Christ's preexistent work? With what did he begin our Lord's existence?

With what Scriptures was he refuted by antitypical Elizur?

(7) When was the next attack launched? By whom? What was his doctrine called? What did he deny? What did he teach as to the Father, Son and Spirit? How did antitypical Elizur refute the errors as to their being no Logos and no Logos' work before the carnation? By what two arguments did he refute the error that there was no Father during the days of Christ's flesh? By what two ways did he refute the thought that there is no Christ since Pentecost?

(8) When was another attack on our Lord's office made? By what theory? How was it refuted? Who were its three main teachers? What was creditable in Praxeas? Who was his opponent? Who was Beryllus' opponent? What creditable thing did Beryllus do? Who was Noëtus' opponent?

(9) Describe Paul of Samosata according to Studies, Vol. II. How was he an opponent to the Logos doctrine? Like what moderns did he think on the Logos? How, like them, did he treat the Logos Scriptures? What was his view? With what did it do away? What were his talents? What did he do with these talents to antitypical Elizur? Describe antitypical Elizur's controversy with him. What was its outcome?

(10) What has since been done with Christ's office before and after the Reformation? What has antitypical Elizur done with them? What has been done with his arguments by members of other denominations? What have these not done to his arguments? Give an illustration of such use of his arguments. What does antitypical Elizur still do? What did he antitype in these controversies?

(11) What else has he offered? Of what was this the antitype? What was the character of his instructions in righteousness? What lesson did he draw from Christ's pre-existent joy in creative works? His obedience in them? His efficiency in them and in the Old Testament revelation? His willingness to be carnate?

(12) What lesson did he draw from Christ's consecration? From His faithfulness? From His graces and fruits of the Spirit manifest in His office works? As what

did he hold Him up? What lesson did he draw from His laying down life? From His readiness, promptness and devotion in His office? From His trustfulness in the Father at death? From His death as an expression of the Father's and His love?

(13) What has he done as to Christ's post-human ministry? His willingness to receive those coming to Him? His faithful appearance before the Father for them? His intercession for them? His teaching them? His justifying them? His sanctifying them? His delivering them? What did he offer in teaching these things? What is a correct estimate of his offerings?

(14) What do the above explanations do with Elizur's offering? What is the character of the doctrine given the Greek Catholic Church as her stewardship? How does God's wisdom find expression in Christ's office? What does this have to do with the place of the Greek Church about the antitypical Tabernacle? What did antitypical Elizur unconsciously do while acting out the antitype of Num. 7: 30-35? What are due God for the understanding of Num. 7: 30-35 antitypically?

(15) Who is the next prince whose offerings are to be considered? What Little Flock movement did he pervert? Into what did he pervert it? Who started this movement? What were the main events and activities of his life?

(16) What does the Greek word *eirenaios* mean? How did it characterize Irenaeus? What was he as to the Smyrna star? Who were his predecessors in this star? What did he do between the Oriental and Occidental Church? What were the circumstances of this activity? What was his main work? Against what was it? Of what was Gnosticism a compound? What was Irenaeus' chief literary work? What did he do by it? What special truth did he emphasize in it? What did such emphasis of it do? How does he describe the Church in its office?

(17) To understand the movement that he started, what must we remember as to the Church? Generally speaking, in how manifold a sense is the Church to be understood? What is the Real Church in its strictest sense? In its general sense? What has the Real Church been called? Why? What is the Church in its second general sense? As such, of whom does it consist? What did Irenaeus not

mean by the Church catholic? What did he mean by it? Why did he speak of the nominal church as the Church? What would leaving the nominal church before the Harvest imply? How should we regard his advocacy of but one Church? Why? What did it introduce?

(18) What do experience and observation prove as to the Church? How must the nominal church be defined? Up to what event? How is this proved by the parable of the wheat and the tares? What are some of the proofs for this in the Epistles? How is this proven by the seven churches of Rev. 1-3? What typical fact proves it?

(19) What did God always do up to 1878? Through whom and to whom did He always give the seasonal Truth? What was it made after it was given? What two things are implied in the Church's stewardship of the Truth? In this connection what thought must not be forgotten? What has the nominal church been to the Real Church in the seven Church epochs? As such what has she been, according to Rev. 1-3? What mistake is often made in the understanding of the terms *nominal* and *Real* Church? What is their relation? Of what two classes does the Real, and of what four classes does the Nominal Church consist? How does this make intelligible Irenaeus' teaching as true, whereby he started a special Little Flock movement? What was the purpose of that movement?

(20) What kind of a movement was it? On account of what was it called into being? Who above all others gave Gnosticism its death blow? What did his arguments against it do? How otherwise did he use his special truth? Against what two movements? What conviction did his teaching deepen? What bent was given his movement? To what Church did the Lord give the pertinent truth as its stewardship? What is the difference between this Church and the papacy? On what distinction has this Church gone wrong? What false claim does it make for itself, a sect? What truth has it nevertheless maintained?

(21) What, also, has this truth as a stewardship? What is the office of the true Church as teacher? This being so, how can the nominal church have this office? What truth in fact has the Roman Catholic Church as its stewardship? How is this related to the hidden mystery? Of what is that mystery the greatest expression? By what

is the Roman Catholic Church and people properly typed? By the standard of what side of the tabernacle is God's wisdom symbolized? Show the relation of the Greek and Roman Churches to one another from the standpoint of this antitypical standard. How is this relation typed?

(22) Relatively, how large is the number of the crown-lost leaders of the Roman Church? Why is this? By whom were they typed? What two Church fathers were especially influential in turning Irenaeus' movement into a sect? From what country were they? What special error did they develop? What has later papacy done with their doctrine of the episcopate? Despite this, how does papacy speak of them? What did they do as parts of antitypical Shelumiel? What errors did they weave into the stewardship truth? What are the main facts and acts of Cyprian's life? How was he related to the Episcopal system of church government and to the Roman bishop? As what is he regarded in the Roman Church?

(23) What is Augustine's standing among Church fathers? What are the main facts of his life? What were his intellectual powers? His position in the Church of his day? Among others, in what three controversies was he the leader? In what controversy did he especially offer as a part of antitypical Shelumiel? How long did it last? By what was its settlement much advanced? How many bishops took part on each side? Who was the leader on each side? What followed it?

(24) What will help us better to appreciate antitypical Shelumiel's offerings? Why? In what ways were the Novatian and Donatist schisms akin? Who was Novatian? Describe the Decian persecution. Amid it what did weak Christians do to save their lives? What was done with Fabian of Rome in this persecution? Who stood for election to his office? Which was elected? What problem presented itself at Rome as a result of the persecution? How was it solved by Cornelius? By Novatian? What two things resulted? Who was made bishop of the schismatic Church? What did the head of each party do? How was Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, brought into the controversy? What was the situation at Carthage on the same problem? Whose side did Cyprian take? What two reasons led him to do this? Into what activity was Cyprian

led by the Novatian schism being referred to him for his opinion? What truth did he emphasize? What errors did he connect with it? How did he reason on this truth and these two errors as against Novatian? Despite these errors, of what was Cyprian's work actually a part?

(25) When did the Donatist schism set in? Out of what problem? What two answers were given? How were the Donatist and Novatian schisms related? What were the events of the controversy, in relation to Constantine, the first Christian Emperor? What was the cause of the schism in Africa? What did the schismatics, especially the begging and traveling monks, do? Why? What state measures were taken against the Donatists? What did Augustine do in the debating part of the controversy? How did the Donatists treat him? What are the main facts in connection with the three-days' Carthage meeting?

(26) What oversight obscured the discussion on both sides? What error did both sides hold? For what mixture of truth and error did Augustine contend? What did he claim as the true Church? What errors did the Donatists teach on the nature, the bishops and the members of the true Church? What did they claim as the true Church? Which side was on the whole nearer the truth? On what truth was the Catholic side right and the Donatist side wrong? What views of the Donatists did not agree with the true view of the Real or of the nominal Church? With what truth did the Catholic way of treating the weak accord? What were the character faults of the Donatist view? What was the end of Donatism? Where were these controversies forecast? Through whom did the Lord give His answer?

(27) On how many other occasions did antitypical Shelumiel offer his charger, bowl and spoon? How will we deal with these? For what two reasons has a summary of the Novatian and Donatist schisms been given? Why are the Roman Catholic crown-lost leaders fittingly antitypical *Shelumiel*? How is their activity further indicated by the name *Zurishaddai*?

(28) What is typed by Shelumiel's offering a charger? How did it correct sectarianism? The party spirit? Teaching error? The pride of variance? The narrow spirit that casts off others for small differences? The harsh

spirit? The exclusive spirit? The censorious spirit? The Pharisaic spirit? How did it correct the stern and repellent spirit of a Novatian and a Donatus?

(29) Whose fine sentiments are quoted to show antitypical Shelumiel's corrections on the above bad qualities? What is a summary of the first quotation from Cyprian? What are the main points of the second quotation from him? What do both quotations prove? Are they the only examples of antitypical Shelumiel's corrections?

(30) What next in antitypical Shelumiel's offerings should engage our attention? What is his bowl? What should be kept in mind while studying his refutations? What did he first mean by the Church? What did he later understand by it? Into what two errors did he fall on this subject? According to whose course in this matter did he act? What did this course prevent him and all other crown-lost leaders from offering? Despite this, what could he do? What could he not do with attacks on his teaching on apostolic succession and the Roman Church? What attacks did he refute?

(31) By what seven arguments did he refute the claims of the defender of each sect that it was the true Church? By these seven arguments what did he unwittingly prove of the Roman Catholic Church? By what three arguments did he disprove the exclusive stewardship of the Truth on the part of each sect? What did these three arguments prove with reference to the Roman Catholic Church? By these ten arguments what was antitypical Shelumiel refuting? What did these activities antitype?

(32) What is meant by antitypical Shelumiel's spoon? How did he stress righteousness? Consecration? Christian brotherliness and fellowship? Faithfulness to one's stewardship? Love for Truth? Hatred for error? Keeping the unity of the faith and the Church? Sympathy? Love for the brethren? A pastoral heart in the leaders and loving meekness in the other brethren? Longsuffering and forgiveness? Love for the Church? Zeal for the Truth and against error? Conciliatoriness and magnanimity? Zealous efforts to rescue the fallen? What kind of a bent did the special truth committed to the Roman Catholic Church give to his ethical teachings? What did his teaching these things antitype?

(33) How many Gospel-Age princes in their offerings have we studied hitherto? What denominations did they develop? What denomination did the sixth Gospel-Age prince develop? Who in this respect typed him? What denomination does Gad type? Explain the discrepancy between the names, Deuel and Reuel. Which is the correct name? Why? What was Gad's place about the tabernacle?

(34) What special doctrine was committed to the stewardship of the Episcopal Church? What Scriptures prove it true? What is the first reason for God's subjecting the Church to the State? How was this reason connected with the Sin-offerings? When is the Church exempt from obedience to the State? What is the second reason for God's subjecting the Church to the State? How is this so? What is the connection between such a relation and the hidden mystery?

(35) With what Divine attribute does the hidden mystery especially connect itself? By what in the camp Was this attribute typed? What Divine attribute does the south of the tabernacle type? As Gad's antitype with what Divine attribute is the Episcopal Church connected? How, from the standpoint of the stewardship doctrines of the Greek, Roman and Anglican Churches, are these denominations typed by the three tribes to the south of the tabernacle? What is the central thought of these three doctrines? By what was it typed?

(36) Who was the Little Flock member that started the movement later perverted into the Episcopal Church? Give an outline of his life up to his meeting Henry VIII. What did he advise Henry VIII as to procedure on determining the status of his marriage? What doctrine did he shortly thereafter announce? In what did his stand on these two matters result, in relation to the pope? What was the pope's course as to the validity of Henry's marriage? What further advance did Cranmer make in the controversy? What are the leading events in Cranmer's life as primate of England? What occurred to him at the accession of Mary? How was he treated in prison? What effect did his severe imprisonment have on his mind and will? What was he on promise of pardon induced to do? Describe the character of five alleged recantations of his.

How did his recantation affect him? Under what impression and circumstances did he abjure his recantation? Describe his heroic and martyr death. What effect did Cranmer's, Latimer's, Ridley's, Hooper's, Ferrar's and 281 other martyrs' burning have on the English people? What calamity overtook their chief persecutors? What ended the persecution?

(37) What will help us better to appreciate the Cranmer-aroused movement? How did papacy encroach on England's prerogatives, etc.? From where did England not first receive Churchianity? Who was the first Roman missionary to England? What pope sent him? Who were the three greatest popes? What did the British bishops do with Gregory's demand? What was the position of Alfred the Great toward papal claims of power in England? How was his position generally maintained in England, until Cranmer's time? What did William the Conqueror do with the demands of Gregory VII? What did his son and successor do with papal demands? Henry I? Henry II?

(38) Despite such vigilance, what was accomplished by the pope from 1100 to 1205? What happened in 1205? Describe the various stages of the conflict between King John, the Lackland, and Innocent III. How did Innocent's usurpations affect the primate and the barons of England? What did they extort from John? What did the pope do with it? What was the course of Henry III toward the pope and his clergy? Of Edward I? Edward III? Richard II? Henry IV? Henry VI? Edward IV? Despite unauthorized concessions, what was never done in England with the pope's claims? What was eventually done against all of them? What does this prove as to the papal claim as to the time of the origin of the Royal supremacy in England? How long was it actually used?

(39) What was a feature of the doctrine that Cranmer championed? What was not and what was his teaching on his great doctrinal contribution to Truth? What was the contrary papal doctrine? What was the Statute of Provisors? Of Praemunire? Who defended them as just and Scriptural? How did he characterize the contrary papal doctrine? In what did papacy's pertinent teaching result? What did Cranmer's teaching do with papacy's

purposes? Why? Who over 150 years before taught the same doctrine as Cranmer now taught? What was the difference in the effect of their teaching? Why?

(40) What was the first cause of Cranmer's teaching on this subject? Describe the steps of progress in the investigation of the status of Henry VIII's marriage. How did the special doctrine of Cranmer's movement affect this matter? What resulted from this relation? What other papal teaching occasioned Cranmer to announce this doctrine? What third thing led Cranmer to announce this teaching?

(41) What did the circumstances of the times do with Cranmer's movement? What did English conditions do with Cranmer's doctrine? How did it affect the pope? How did the English nation act in connection with it? What cannot militate against this movement? What did it accomplish in England? In every country of Christendom?

(42) What peculiar phenomenon meets us in most sectarian developments in Protestantism? In harmony with this what did Cranmer do? What in this did he and other Little Flock leaders antitype? When did Cranmer make most of his mistakes? What have papists done with them? Next to whom does Cranmer rank in effectiveness as a Reformer? What proves this? Compare their works. Contrast their Reformation sphere, their qualities and their political surroundings. What should we do for these servants of God?

(43) Who were the main crown-lost leaders of the Episcopal Church? What Little Flock leaders before them did some sectarianizing work with Cranmer's movement? How was it perverted into a sect? Under what primate? What are some of its leading sectarian features? What was later done with its sectarian development? Under whom? How did they pervert the truth that Cranmer gave? What did this error do with England's rulers? On what truth given by Cranmer did they stand firm? What did this enable them to do? How is this typed in the meanings of the names, Eliasaph and Deuel?

(44) What occurred while Cranmer's movement was in operation? What principles caused it? What three things turned Henry against the papacy? On whose advice did

he act? What did he determine to do? In what did this result? Who supported the king? What did he do to the pope? Whom did he place over the English Church? How did Cranmer stand on this? Why is Protestantism not chargeable with Henry's wrongs? What were his relations to Protestantism? How did he further it?

(45) What did Pope Paul III do as to Henry VIII? What hindered him for three years from publishing it? What was this pope's stand while yet a cardinal toward Henry's marriage? Of what hypocrisy was he guilty in this bull? What was his real reason for it?

(46) How many sections did the bull have? What is the tenor of its preamble? Of its first three sections? What are the main penalties of this bull?

(47) What quality does this bull have? What qualities of the papacy are revealed in it? What should its mere reading do? How must it be regarded by papists? Why? What does it prove of modern popes? Give illustrations where it would have been duplicated, if practical? What did Henry do as to this bull? How did he retaliate and secure himself and country? What did Cranmer and his colleagues do with the bull? What was the result for 15 years? What then set in? What did Mary do for Rome and to Protestants? What is she justly called? Why? What did she claim? On what did she ground her claim?

(48) What is antitypical Eliasaph's charger? What class of religionists did he especially rebuke? For what at first? Especially in whose reign? For what four offenses did he rebuke English Catholics? For what five wrongs did he rebuke the pope? For what sins of omission and commission did he rebuke the nobility and common people of England? What classes were included in his rebukes?

(49) What will help in the understanding of antitypical Eliasaph's bowl? What were Elizabeth's main qualities as a ruler and woman? What was England's condition religiously at her accession? How did she meet the resultant difficulties? What were her main acts to change England from papacy to Protestantism? What were the effects? What did she do with the clergy? What did the law do, leave undone and forbid? What was the result as to persecution for one's faith? What Church did she favor?

What was the result of her policy? How long did she reign?

(50) What did the popes seek to do with her at first? How did she meet these advances? Why? What did her love for and devotion to her subjects' welfare effect for her? What was the effect of her policy in about 12 years?

(51) What papal bull was issued in 1570? What does its preamble set forth? What does its first section set forth? Its second? Its third? Its fourth? Its fifth? Its sixth?

(52) What was the effect of the bull on England? What did Parliament do? What three things did some of her Catholic subjects do? What was done with them? What does Rome count them? What considerations refute this estimate? What did a fair sized body of Catholics do? What resulted? Who were the instigators? What law was passed as to such persons?

(53) How long did Catholic monarchs delay carrying out the pope's sentence on Elizabeth and her supporters? What made the pope insistent on their acting? Who undertook it? What two preparations did he make for it? What was his plan with these? How did England meet the situation? What effect did the queen have on the army? What did the pope do in anticipation of a victory? What did he do with the Armada and the whole enterprise? For what five things did the papal clergy and people pray? What happened as to answers? Compare and contrast the opposing fleets and commanders. When did the Armada enter the English Channel? What were the features of the first battle? What was the result? What then occurred? What happened the night of Aug. 7, 1588? What resulted? How long did the British pursue the Armada? What then happened to it? What were its losses in ships and men? What happened to Parma and his army?

(54) What was repeated? What was the eventual outcome? What other popish plots were fomented? What does papacy's course in these events prove as to Rom. 13: 1-6, etc.? Amid what events did antitypical Eliasaph offer his bowl? Why has so much space in this chapter been devoted to political history? How have papal theologians

sought to vindicate the papal course in these and similar events? What did antitypical Eliasaph do with his arguments? Who were his chief three representatives in this? What was his chief anti-papal book? Describe it. From what three sources did he take his arguments? What are the seven papal proofs on the pope's supremacy?

(55) What did antitypical Eliasaph concede as to Peter's primacy? By what seven lines of argument did he disprove the papal arguments on Peter's supremacy and jurisdiction over the Apostles and the Church? How did he refute the other six papal propositions on papal supremacy in the Church?

(56) What follows from his disproof of these seven propositions? How did he disprove the papal supremacy in State from history? What did this also destroy? How did he disprove it from the Bible? From reason and natural right?

(57) How did he offer his spoon? How did he show our obligation to obey even a tyrannical ruler? What graces did his spoon further? What general steps of the Christian life? Where especially did he produce good fruits?

A mighty Fortress is our God,
A trusty Shield and Weapon;
He helps us free from every need
That hath us now o'er taken.
The old bitter foe
Means us deadly woe:
Deep guile and great might,
Are His dread arms in fight.
On earth is not His equal.

With might of ours can naught be done,
Soon were our loss effected;
But for us fights the Valiant One
Whom God Himself elected.
Ask ye, Who is this?
Jesus Christ it is,
Jehovah's mighty Son,
And there's no other One;
He holds the field forever.

CHAPTER VI.

THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES (CONTINUED). Num. 7: 48-65.

THE OFFERINGS OF ANTITYPICAL ELISHAMA. OF ANTITYPICAL GAMALIEL. OF ANTITYPICAL ABIDAN. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IN NUM. 7 the princes of the three tribes to the west of the tabernacle are described in their offerings *after* those of the tribes to the south of the tabernacle are described. The three tribes to the tabernacle's west, constituting the camp of Ephraim, are Ephraim, Manasseh and Benjamin. The standard of this camp, typing God's justice as we have seen, likely had as its symbol the ox or bullock. We have already seen that Ephraim types the Lutheran Church, Manasseh the Congregational Church and Benjamin the fanatical churches, especially the Quakers. The stewardship doctrine of the Lutheran Church is justification by God's grace through faith in Christ s merit. It therefore pertains to justice. The stewardship doctrine of the Congregational Church is the equality of *rights* on the part of all the brethren, expressed in church government of, by and for all the brethren—also a matter of justice. And the stewardship doctrine of the fanatical sects, *i.e.*, the Quakers, the holiness people, etc., is right living Godward and manward as opposed to all formalism—also a matter of justice. Thus we see that God's attribute of justice is the central idea of the figurative tribes to the West of the antitypical Tabernacle, even as the three corresponding typical tribes seem to have had on their standard the representation of an ox or bullock, the symbol of justice (Ezek. 1 and Rev. 4).

(2) We have in these columns shown that Ephraim types in the tabernacle picture the Lutheran Church, while the Ephraimites type the Lutherans. In the

Gospel-Age picture the Lutheran Church and people are typed by Jacob's son Levi in connection with Jacob's begetting and Leah's bearing him. But because the Levites were taken as the sacred tribe in the tabernacle picture, and because Joseph and Benjamin, in connection with Jacob's begetting them and Rachel's bearing them are used to type the Little Flock harvest movement and people and the Great Company movement and people respectively, and because Joseph's two sons were given separate tribal standings, we in the tabernacle picture must regard the Lutherans with the Congregationalists and the fanatical sects, being not in the picture of Jacob's sons in their begetting and birth, as being the antitype of these three tribes—the two tribes of Joseph's descendants and the tribe of Benjamin. Ephraim, the most important of the three, would naturally type the Lutheran Church, by far the most important of the three denominations under consideration. The idea of the priesthood of the consecrated giving color to the church government of all three of these denominations also shows them to be of the same camp. The precedence of Ephraim and Manasseh over Benjamin causes us to conclude that the Lutheran and Congregational Churches are typed by the first named; and the inferiority of Benjamin suggests that the fanatical sects are typed by the tribe of Benjamin. In this way we harmonize the difference in the antitypes of Jacob's sons at their begettal and birth for Gospel-Age purposes and of the tribes about the tabernacle for Gospel-Age purposes.

(3) In the first part of this chapter on The Offerings Of The Gospel-Age Princes we desire to discuss those of the prince of antitypical Ephraim (Num. 7: 48-53)—the crown-lost leaders of the Lutheran Church. Their type is Elishama, the son of Ammihud. *Elishama* means *God hears*. This name characterizes the crown-lost leaders of the Lutheran Church from the standpoint that justification by God's

grace through faith in Christ's merit guarantees a favorable *hearing* from God on behalf of those who in living, childlike trust in Christ's merit for acceptance approach God for forgiveness of sins and the imputation of Christ's merit. *Ammihud* means *my people is majesty*, *i.e.*, *glorious*. It seems to indicate the high honor in which, according to the crown-lost Lutheran leaders, the faith-justified are held by God and those in harmony with Him. The following are the main crown-lost leaders who co-operated in perverting the Little Flock movement started by Luther into a sect and maintained it as such: Jonas, Bugenhagen, Chemnitz, Andreae, Gerhard, Calov, Quenstedt and Hollaz. But while considering Luther the Little Flock originator of, and Melanchthon as his Little Flock co-laborer in, the Little Flock movement that was later perverted into the Lutheran Church, we must in justice admit that they were as parts of blinded antitypical Samson more instrumental than all others, except the Protestant princes of Germany, in perverting this movement into the Lutheran denomination.

(4) The doctrine which God made the special stewardship teaching of the Lutheran Church, and which its crown-lost leaders applied and defended, is justification by faith. If we should briefly state this doctrine in its main features, we might put it as follows: Justification by God's grace through faith in Christ's merit. Several things are implied in this doctrine: (1) that the justification of a human being is not by good works, either under the natural or under the Mosaic law; for justly condemned and imperfect man cannot by his fallen powers under the natural law or under the Mosaic law act sinlessly and perfectly, and hence cannot satisfy the demands of justice by his own works (Rom. 1: 16—3: 20; Gal. 2: 16, 21; 3: 10-12); (2) that God in grace—unmerited favor—provided His Son to be a propitiation of Divine justice on behalf of Adam's sin and all others'

sins resulting from Adam's sin (Rom. 3: 21-26; 4: 25; 5: 7-21; Gal. 4: 4, 5; John 3: 15, 16; 1 John 1: 7—2: 2; 4: 10); (3) that Christ freely gave Himself up to death to satisfy God's justice for the life of the race and fulfilled the Law to work out a righteousness for man (Matt. 20: 28; 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6; Rom. 5: 15-19; 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22; Gal. 3: 13); (4) that God by the Word offers gratuitously justification to the repentant sinner who will heartily believe His promise that for the sake of Jesus' merit He will forgive him and account him righteous in Christ's righteousness (Luke 24: 47; Acts 3: 19; 13: 38, 39; Rom. 3: 25, 26); (5) that the repentant sinner who heartily believes this promise is fieely forgiven and receives the imputed righteousness of Christ as his righteousness (Rom. 4: 2-8, 22-24; 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Phil. 3: 9); (6) that justification is therefore God's act, not ours, and is therefore declarative and reckoned or imputative on His part, and not actually effected by and in us, *i.e.*, we do not justify ourselves, and our justification does not actually make, it only reckons, us perfect (Rom. 8: 33; 4: 5-8; 3: 20, 26; Gal. 2: 16; 3: 10-12, 21, 22; Phil. 3: 9; 1 John 1: 7—2: 2); and (7) that in justification faith is imputed as righteousness because, holding Christ's righteousness as its own, it is the only requirement for justification asked by God from the repentant sinner (Rom. 3: 28; 4: 3—5: 1; 10: 4, 10; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Gal. 2: 16, 17). In harmony with the above propositions antitypical Elishama applied and defended the propositions that God is the source and effective cause of justification, that Christ is its meritorious cause and that faith is its instrumental cause. Certainly this is a true and Biblical doctrine, and because of what its constituent elements are, it is one of the most important doctrines of the Bible. Its very nature caused its reformatory propounder—Luther—to give the papacy the hardest blow of any delivered by the Reformers.

To make this statement apparent it will be well for us to look at several pertinent aspects of the papacy.

(5) The papacy in its organization, teachings and practices cannot be properly understood, unless it is recognized as Antichrist. As Antichrist it is Satan's counterfeit of the Christ's organization, teachings and practices. In other words, Satan depraved in counterfeit forms the organization, teachings and practices of the Christ in their entirety. Among other things, he has in the papacy counterfeited the entire Millennial arrangement for man's recovery and has counterfeited the time of its operation, putting it into the Gospel Age. The Scriptures clearly teach that after the Christ's merit in the Millennium has freed the world from the Adamic sentence, the world through the priestly, kingly, prophetic, mediatorial, parental, healing and judging ministry of the Christ will gradually attain actual—not a reckoned—justification, and that by works, while for Gospel-Age purposes they teach that justification is by faith, apart from works. Such papal changing of "times and laws" brought in its train a multitude of errors, all in more or less opposition to justification by faith. Thus the idea of the Catholics justifying themselves by works and through them receiving forgiveness of guilt and of the penalty of sins, is in itself a counterfeit of certain Millennial trespass offerings, and of course, is an error from the standpoint of faith justification as now operative. The cancellation of the Millennial world's Adamic condemnation is counterfeited in papacy's water baptism, which is held to cancel the Adamic guilt and its resultant sins committed before baptism. The Millennial Christ as Priest, King, Prophet, Physician, Parents, Mediator and Judge, is counterfeited by the pertinently claimed offices of the papacy. The mass counterfeits the sacrifice of the Church as a part of the Sin-offering. Purgatory counterfeits the kingdom stripes purging

from more or less of wrong-doing. Penance counterfeits the real contrition for, confession of and satisfaction for wrongs Millennially. The monks and nuns counterfeit the Millennial Ancient and Youthful Worthies. The former's vows and asceticism counterfeit the consecration vows and self-denials of the latter. The beatified counterfeit the Millennial Great Company; and the canonized counterfeit the Millennial Little Flock. The so-called good works of the papal laity—fastings, prayers, pilgrimages, alms, deeds, contributions, etc.—counterfeit the good works of the restitution class. Papal prayers to the saints counterfeit the restitutionists' prayers to the Millennial Church, while papal prayers to Mary and Peter probably counterfeit prayers made to the two at our Lord's right and left. The intervention of Papal saints counterfeits the mediatorship of the Millennial saints. Indulgences counterfeit the Millennial forgiveness of weakness and ignorance. Confirmation counterfeits the Millennial strengthenings of the restitutionists. The papal Lord's Supper counterfeits the Millennial Memorial symbol of Christ's and the Church's death and of the benefits conferred. Ordination counterfeits the making of priests of the Gospel-Age consecrated. Extreme unction counterfeits the final help given by the Christ to the restitution class before the Little Season. The ceremony of matrimony might counterfeit making the world one with the Christ (Is. 62: 5). Tradition as part of the rule and source of faith and practice is the counterfeit of the Millennial revelations on faith and practice. The papal idea of faith as only belief counterfeits the Millennial faith, which will not be one without sight. Papal reverence for relics, pictures and images of saints counterfeits the reverence of the restitution class for the acts and characters of the real saints. And papal feasts counterfeit the experiences of the restitutionists in the blessings wrought by the Christ in

His various memorable acts. As one looks at these features of the papal counterfeit, he will see more or less of a relation between them and the papal doctrine of justification by works; for all of these things are in the papacy so taught as to be made use of to secure forgiveness of sins and eternal life by the papal laity. Therefore the entire papal scheme of salvation runs athwart the doctrine of faith justification. If the former prevails, the latter falls. If the latter prevails, the former falls. Hence the Divine wisdom in beginning through the teaching of justification by faith the Protestant Reformation assault on the papal way of salvation—justification by works.

(6) The member of antitypical Jacob through whom the reform movement having as its keynote the doctrine of justification by faith was inaugurated was Martin Luther, who was also at the same time the hero of the entire Reformation. He was born at Eisleben, Saxony, a state of Germany, Nov. 10, 1483, and died there Feb. 18, 1546. His father was first a miner, then a slate cutter. Young Martin was educated first at Magdeburg, then later (1498-1501) at Eisenach, where singing for his food, as was then the custom of poor students, he was favored by Mrs. Ursula Cotta with a home. In 1501 he entered the University of Erfurt as a law student, graduated in 1505 and began to lecture at this University. The same year, against his parents' insistence, he became a monk of the Augustinian Order. He became a priest in 1507, and in the next year became professor of philosophy at the newly founded University of Wittenberg, Saxony. He visited Rome in 1510 on business of his order. In 1512 he was made a Doctor of the Holy Scriptures, which entitled him to lecture and write on the Bible anywhere in Christendom. Henceforth he lectured on the Bible at the University. Oct. 31, 1517, he nailed his 95 theses to the Castle Church door at Wittenberg, as a protest against Tetzel's infamous

indulgence traffic. These created an immense sensation throughout Christendom and started the Reformation. They were condemned as heretical by the papacy. In 1519 he debated with Dr. Eck, Rome's champion, on the powers of the papacy, and in the year 1520 he published two works that greatly forwarded the Reformation: (1) An Address to the Christian Nobles of the German Nation; and (2) The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, which latter called forth a royal reply from Henry VIII, answered crushingly by Luther. In 1520 he answered the papal bull of excommunication, by burning it and a copy of the canon law before the University's faculty and student body and the entire citizenry of Wittenberg, declaring the papacy to be Antichrist and renouncing it and its cause. Cited to appear before the Imperial Diet at Worms to answer before the emperor and the estates of the empire, he made, in a long address, April, 1521, a most humble, clear and heroic defense of his doctrines, ending with the memorable words, "Hereon I stand. I can do naught else. So help me God! Amen!" He—the papally excommunicated heretic—was now outlawed by the emperor. After leaving Worms he was, as through an understanding in which he shared, ostensibly captured by some disguised knights and taken to the Wartburg, where he remained with intermittent absences until March, 1522. Here he translated the New Testament into German from the original Greek.

(7) Had Luther died at the Wartburg, there would have been no shadow on his reformatory work; but here he concluded that his reformatory movement would be crushed, if he would not become a partner with the friendly princes and estates of the empire; and henceforth he became increasingly the captive of the Protestant nobility as a part of antitypical blinded Samson grinding out the meal for the antitypical Philistines, sectarians. From here on Luther became

decidedly more conservative and compromised not a few of the logical conclusions of his principles in the interests of the shortly to be formed sectarian body named against his will after him—the Lutheran Church. More than all others, apart from the rulers, was he instrumental in sectarianizing the noble Reform movement that he had inaugurated. But despite his shortcomings, he is easily the hero of the stupendous drama called, The Reformation; and also despite his shortcomings he was adorned with very many noble qualities of the first order. He united a sublime faith and courage with a deep humility and simplicity. His self-oblivion and his generosity were as great as his companionableness and loyalty were strong. His unique firmness and aggressiveness were matched by a remarkable love and forgiveness. His mental, moral and religious qualities and his practical ability in securing wonderful results from his efforts made him a genius of the highest order, placing him among the foremost of the twenty greatest men that have ever lived. His reactionary and sectarian spirit from 1522 onward have often raised the question in our mind as to whether he retained his place in the Little Flock. From the Samson type and from the fact that he did not revolutionize against the truths that he saw we believe that he did, yet we were not without misgivings when we considered that he sectarianized his reform movement, co-operated in uniting Church and State, fought the Zwinglian truth on the Lord's Supper, the Hubmaierian truth on exclusive adult baptism and the Servetian truth on the unity of God, and invented various errors against these truths. But he could not properly be called revolutionizing on these subjects, not having ever seen the Truth on them. He was undoubtedly loyal to the great truth entrusted to him to expound, apply and defend. And he did this decidedly more ably and fruitfully than any other Reformer did with his special stewardship truth;

and he is the only Reformer who succeeded in stamping his stewardship truth on the other Reform movements and churches. Therefore he is the most universal of the Reformers, and is by all Protestant sects given the first place among the Reformers. We fully agree that this pre-eminence is his from the standpoint of mental, moral, and religious qualities, and of practical genius.

(8) While we will not trace the course of Luther's life after his return to Wittenberg from the Wartburg, as we did before that return, it would be helpful to an understanding of our subject to point out how Luther was led to see and use the doctrine of justification by faith. On the one hand, by heredity and development he had a very tender conscience, which condemned the slightest recognized imperfection in his disposition, thoughts, motives, words or acts; yet, on the other hand, he had the deepest cravings for peace with God and for the sense of His approval and fellowship. Therefore under the legalistic spirit of Rome he feared and dreaded God as a hostile and revengeful Judge, whom in some way he must placate. His Church pointed to its sacraments and good works backed by the intercession of saints as the means of obtaining peace with God, and made him believe that he could best accomplish this through the meritoriousness of monastic life. Hence, despite parental objections, he became a monk, hoping by the "good works" of the Augustinian Order to obtain the coveted peace with God. Accordingly, he fasted until he was almost a skeleton and became a semi-invalid. He prayed often the whole night in agony for the desired peace. He did the most menial work for his bother monks in order to attain his quest. He begged from house to house for his order in the same hope. He performed accentuated penances with the same object in view. Thus he could truly say of himself, "If there was ever a pious monk, it was I" But he found no

peace by these exercises. Always the monitor within faulted him in his best endeavors and works. And if he, imperfect as he was, could see condemnable things in himself, so he reasoned, how much more could God do so. His pathetic sighs, groans and cries for God's approval were sympathetically heard by his brother monks, one of whom sought to comfort and pacify him with the words, "Bro. Martin, do you not believe the words of the creed, 'I believe in . . . the forgiveness of sins' ?" Thus did Luther's struggles continue for years, his Church being unable to bring peace with its "sacraments and good works."

(9) But in due time God had mercy on this deeply distressed monk, through the doctrine of faith justification. His study of the Scriptures brought him to meditate very deeply and often on the Lord's word in the passages, "the just shall live [gain life] by faith" (Gal. 3: 11) and "the righteousness of God [the righteousness that God in Christ's merit provided for man] without the law [apart from the works of the law] is manifested . . . even the righteousness of God which is by the faith [fullness] of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory [character-likeness] of God, being freely justified by His grace through the redemption [deliverance] that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3: 21-24). Gradually, like the dawn, the light began to arise on his heart until, like a sunburst it filled his soul with peace and joy. Now he realized that while none of his works, which at best were but imperfect, could satisfy God's justice and thus effect peace between God and himself, yet God in marvelous love arranged for Christ's death and righteousness to satisfy God's justice for him, and that to get the benefit of this all he had to do was heartily to believe that God graciously for Christ's merit forgave his sins and accounted him righteous. This Luther, with all the

strength of a powerful mind and heart, seized upon as true, and from such a faith received the coveted peace with God, as a veritable sunburst from heaven after a dark and stormy night of distress. Henceforth he triumphed in the thought of Holy Writ, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 5: 1). This account of Luther's experience shows that he proved by his life's experience the falsity of papacy's way of salvation "through the sacraments and good works" and the Truth of God's way to justification—faith in the grace of God manifested in Christ's merit. Henceforth this doctrine became the center of Luther's life and teachings. Hence when Tetzel came to the neighborhood of Wittenberg selling his indulgences, he impinged against the darling doctrine of Luther's heart, and out of that impingement sprang first the 95 theses and later the Protestant Reformation. "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform." And so closely related to faith justification is Luther's life and character that we naturally think of him when the doctrine of justification by faith comes to mind. Probably his ablest discussion of this doctrine is in his second Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.

(10) Let us pause awhile and contemplate how this doctrine as a veritable stump-rooter tore up the entire tree of papal error on justification and related matters. One does not usually, especially not at once, draw all the logical conclusions implied in one's principles. This was true of Luther in connection with his belief on justification. It was about 1510 when he attained peace through heartily believing God's promise of gratuitous forgiveness through faith in Christ's merit. But so far as we know, he did not draw from these premises any conclusion against any papal doctrine until the fall of 1517, when the Dominican monk, Tetzel, began in the vicinity of Wittenberg to hawk indulgences for sins at so much per.

In the confessional Luther, who insisted on his penitents exercising repentance toward God and faith in Christ as the conditions of absolution, learned that, without repentance and faith, solely on the basis of having paid Tetzel for indulgences, his confessants demanded absolution. This Luther refused to give on such a ground. A papal indulgence is a full or partial grant of remission of sin and its penalties in this life or in purgatory by virtue of the so-called treasury of the saints' merits, deposited with the papacy. The papal theory is that the saints merited more than their own salvation required. This surplus merit consisted of what is papally called works of supererogation. On dying, these saints bequeath these surplus works to the Church, which, keeping them in its treasury, can apply them to its members who lack sufficient merit to escape present and purgatorial punishment. Indulgences originated during the Crusades and were offered to those who would undertake a crusade against the Moslems. Then, because some could not go, they hired substitutes and thus obtained the coveted indulgences. By and by it came about that the money that was wont to go to a substitute, if paid to the Church, would effect the same purpose. Later, sins were variously catalogued at so much per, dependent on the means of those seeking indulgences. Thus the people got and lived out the thought from the indulgence hawkers that they could sin at will, if they paid for the privilege by way of indulgences. Not infrequently they would purchase indulgences for sins that they were contemplating committing in the future. Such an indulgence Tetzel sold to a nobleman, and he himself proved to be the one against whom the nobleman intended to sin in revenge for a wrong that Tetzel had done him. With this intent the nobleman asked how much an indulgence would cost granting him remission for a contemplated act of physical injury on, and robbery of, an enemy. Tetzel's price struck the

nobleman as too high, so he "jewed" Tetzel down in the price. Finally the lowered price was acceptable to the nobleman, and paying for, and receiving the indulgence that supposedly pardoned him from the guilt and punishment of his contemplated sin, he left Tetzel. Sometime later he waylaid Tetzel, beat him up famously and robbed him of the contents of his treasury chest. Tetzel appealed to the courts, but confronted with his indulgence and pointed out by the nobleman as being the enemy meant by him when he bought the indulgence, Tetzel could obtain no redress

(11) The traffic in indulgences is characteristically papal, and is as revelatory of papal corruption as probably anything else in that system. No wonder that Tetzel's shameless trafficking in them shocked Luther through and through, and led him at once to question the merchandising of indulgences. Later on, through a logical deduction from the doctrine of faith justification, the whole idea of indulgences became repugnant to him, and he rejected them entirely, as contrary to God's gratuitous forgiveness through Christ's merit received by faith. When Dr. Eck, as against faith justification, defended indulgences and also the absolute authority of the pope as proven by tradition, Luther was led to reject tradition as a part of the source and rule of faith and practice in favor of the Scriptures as the sole source and rule of faith and practice. Soon the doctrine of justification by faith led Luther to reject the mass as repugnant to the merit of Christ received by faith alone; for papacy teaches that Christ's death covers only original sin, and the sins prior to water baptism, but that the mass takes care of all sins of the living and dead committed after baptism. Hence justification by faith with one stroke of the word, as a besom of destruction, overthrew the whole structure of the mass. It was but another logical step to deny purgatory; for if Christ's merit forgives all our .sins (1 John 1: 7), there can

be no purgatory where a believer's sins are made good for. The meritoriousness of fasting, praying, pilgrimages, crusades, penances, vows of celibacy, poverty, and obedience to ecclesiastics, alms-deeds, endowments of masses, churches and other papal projects, etc., as means of obtaining forgiveness of sin's guilt and penalty, fell to the ground in the face of justification by faith in Christ's merit. This led Luther to reject monasticism; and his own marriage, and that with an ex-nun, put the seal of practice on such rejection. Of course, justification by faith did away entirely with the idea of the saint's merit being necessary for the believer, as it led to the rejection of the ideas that they intercede for us and that we should pray to them. Consequently their relics, pictures and images lost caste with the believer, who will ever appreciate the characters and deeds of real saints. Justification by faith soon put down the Virgin Mary from her place as queen of heaven and the special intermediary of believers in approaching God and Christ. It set aside the thought of the satisfaction of Divine justice through penitential works. It dispensed with the papal priesthood and hierarchy in their capacity of intermediary between God and the consecrated believer, who is a priest, and rightly exalted Christ as the sole Priest Godward for them. Justification by faith destroyed papal sacramentarianism, whereby the mere external use of the sacraments is supposed to convey grace. It also overthrew the papal idea of the Church and of the Romish Church as being the Church. In a word, the whole papal institution and its method of gaining life were set aside by this one doctrine. Surely it was the stump-rooter, tearing up the entire papal tree. As we see this result we marvel at God's strategic wisdom, which smote papacy with a mortal wound by that part of the Sword of the Spirit treating of justification by faith.

(12) While Luther saw many of the features of

faith justification clearly, there were others that he did not see. He did not see the distinction between tentative and vitalized justification. He knew nothing of tentative justification. Nor did he realize the function of faith justification in God's plan as the preparatory step for the high calling; for he thought that it made one a priest, whereas this was done in consecration and spirit-begetting. He believed that it entitled one to heaven, instead of making him acceptable for the high calling, faithfulness in which prepares for heaven. His emphasis on faith justification apart from works as entitling one to heaven, made him fail to do justice to the passages that teach that the overcoming of the consecrated and their attaining the heavenly reward are dependent on their faithful fulfillment of their consecration vows (Rev. 2: 10, 25, 26; 3: 21; 2 Pet. 1: 5-10). For these deficiencies we are not to fault Luther; for the full Truth on faith justification was not due before the Harvest; and no one can give a truth either in part or in full until it is due as such. Rather let us praise God for the large amount of light that He gave Luther; for when we consider the deep papal darkness in which Luther, like others, was enveloped, we marvel at the amount of clear light that he saw and spread.

(13) As said above, Luther himself was, next to his rulers, the chief one who sectarianized the noble reform movement that God inaugurated through him. Returning to Wittenberg from the Wartburg in March, 1522, with the thought that he must have the support of the civil power to retain and increase the gains of his reform movement as against the papacy, he first had to overthrow the fanatical and disorderly movement at Wittenberg led by Carlstadt, one of his fellow professors, in fact the University's rector. Carlstadt held that everything papal must be set aside. Hence he cast out the mass, the Latin language in the services, relics, images, pictures, vestments and every other

papal symbol from the churches. This was accompanied by much disorder and rioting. Luther, a great conservative, was repelled by this course and left the Wartburg without his ruler's consent, to oppose this fanaticism. In eight discourses, on as many days, he set forth his views of the matter, won over the entire community and put an end to the disorder. This result pleased his ruler, Frederick the Wise, who sympathized with Luther, but as far as Luther's cause was concerned also tried to keep on good terms with the pope and the emperor. Luther still continued a reform work, but on much more conservative lines than before he went to Worms. Before many years had passed he had won from Rome about nine-tenths of Germany, as well as greatly furthered the Reformation in other lands. To minister to this ever-increasing following, *under his ruler's general direction*, he organized the Lutheran Church, giving it its order of service, its hymnals, its catechism, and with Melanchthon's co-operation, its ministry and its earlier creeds. This course and its implications led him into many controversies with those who taught differently from the creed of his Church. He always recognized his ruler as the highest official of his Church, and was used by the latter to give advice and advocacy to the policies and teachings agreed to. His activities, literary, epistolary, professorial, pulpit, pastoral, traveling and social were enormous. Few, if any, have ever done more within the same number of years as constituted the period of his reformatory activities, 1517-1546, in all about 28 years and 3⅓ months. He was literally a slave to his sect, and was the first member of the larger antitypical Samson to be captured, to have his powers taken from him, to be blinded and thus made to grind out the meal for the sectarians—the antitypical Philistines. While he shared very ably in the last three exploits of the pre-captive larger Samson, typed by Samson's three exploits done just before

his captivity set in—overthrew (1) the new forms of papal doctrines; (2) the new forms of papal practices set forth to counteract the Reformation, and (3) the papal attacks on his doctrines; yet he slaved more and more for the antitypical Philistines from the Wartburg on; and this slavery was largely responsible for the growing irritability and intolerance of his later years. Almost every blot on his otherwise most praiseworthy course was due to this slavery. We glory in the free Luther; we weep for the enslaved Luther; and we hope for the best for the departed Luther, *i.e.*, that he is in the Little Flock.

(14) The galaxy of scholars that the Lutheran Church has marshaled in its universities and churches in application and defense of her stewardship truth—justification by faith—is, at least, equal to that of any other Church. We even doubt whether the equals of Chemnitz, Gerhard and Calov, the three ablest crown-lost leaders of the Lutheran Church, can be found in the ranks of any other denomination as appliers and defenders of their pertinent stewardship truths. Of Martin Chemnitz the Lutherans have the saying, "Had Martin [Chemnitz] not come, Martin [Luther] would not have stood." This was said with main reference to Chemnitz's great work, "The Examination Of The Council Of Trent," the ablest anti-Catholic work of all Protestantism, written as a check to the counter-Reformation movement led by the Jesuits. Bellarmine, the ablest of Rome's anti-Protestant writers, while answering Protestants in general, put forth his very hardest and ablest efforts to refute this work of Chemnitz, and failed. From the small Gospel-Age picture we gather that Chemnitz was a Little Flock member until after the publication of the above-mentioned work. Thereafter he devoted his labors to sect building amid the controversies that led up to the preparation of the Formula of Concord, the last of the general creeds of the Lutheran Church, and mainly

Chemnitz's work. In connection with this work he seems to have lost his crown. John Gerhard is the ablest of all Lutheran dogmaticians and probably the ablest dogmatician of all Christendom. Chemnitz wrote before Bellarmine, and Gerhard after Bellarmine; and when Gerhard was through with Bellarmine's arguments they were on the scrap heap. Chemnitz, though a voluminous writer, was not so much so as Gerhard, while Calov was even a more voluminous writer than Gerhard. Calov seemed to be unable to rest comfortably, if a year should pass without his having written and published at least a thousand-paged quarto—a book almost the size of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary ! In a preceding paragraph we mentioned other Lutheran crown-lost leaders than these. Many others could be mentioned; for the Lutheran Church is generally recognized as being the Church of theologians. These crown-lost leaders have prepared classics on justification by faith; for it was their favorite doctrine. Gerhard's treatise on this subject in his chief work, Theological Topics, covers about 500 quarto pages of rather small type. His application and proof of this doctrine and his refutation of objections, is indescribably thorough, final and complete. Catholic theologians who have attempted to battle with it found that they were biting at something harder than adamant.

(15) These crown-lost leaders have on this doctrine offered their charger—corrections of bad qualities and conduct. They have shown that this doctrine is peculiarly adapted to put aside pride; for it shows that fallen man can do nothing to make himself acceptable to God. They have shown that it certainly corrects self-righteousness; for it proves all our righteousness to be as filthy rags. They have thoroughly proven that it corrects self-confidence; for it proves that we have nothing of our own on which we can trust for acceptance before God. They have clearly

shown that it corrects every man-made scheme for self-atonement and self-justification as improper inventions of sinful humans and as making God a Falsifier in His Word. They have used it to correct man's self-sufficiency for his relations with God; for it proves that no one is able to redeem himself. They have also used it to show the folly of man's trust in his ability along evolutionary lines finally to make himself perfect; for it implies man's increasing depravity. They have used it to rebuke the insults given to Christ in seeking the intercession and merits of saints to make one right with God. They have also used it to correct the conduct that looks upon God as a hardhearted monster who seems to delight in the punishment of the wicked. They have used it to correct the arrogance of priestcraft in setting itself forth as the intermediary between God and the believer. They have used it as a correction of hierarchism as controlling man's relations to God. They have used it to correct the wickedness that would sin that grace may abound. They have used it as a correction to unbelief that would not accept God's provisions on man's behalf. They have used it to correct the despair that some have felt because of sin. They have used it to correct the lovelessness of some toward God, who has made such gracious provisions for them; and to correct some who have despised weak brethren for whom Christ died, and who have been favored by the participation in His imputed righteousness. They have used it to correct the spirit of fear that some exercise toward God because of their sense of guilt, and the spirit of ingratitude that others show toward God in not appreciating His goodness toward them. They have used it to correct the indifference of some toward others who have experienced faith justification. They have used its graciousness to correct the unkind and covetous spirit that some have exercised. They have used it to correct the spirit of those who love sin.

Thus on all sides they have applied this doctrine to the correction of misconduct, and in so doing they have offered their antitypical charger.

(16) In offering their bowl—refutations—the crown-lost leaders of the Lutheran Church have had to meet the ablest and subtlest attacks that Romanist controversialists could make. And some of these were men of great talent, learning and dialectic skill. Cardinal Bellarmine in the field of dogmatics, Cardinal Baronius in the field of Church History and Bishop Bossuet in the field of elegant authorship have been Rome's chief champions, Bellarmine being easily the ablest of these three. Bellarmine made as good a showing for the bad cause that he had to champion as perhaps could have been done by any human being. Unlike most Catholic controversialists he clearly, copiously and truly stated all the Protestant arguments and then sought to refute them. This fair course of his was one of the two reasons that moved Pope Sextus VI to put Bellarmine's greatest controversial work, his Disputations, on the Index of Expurgated Books, fearing that such statements of the Protestant arguments would injure the Catholic cause. Later this work was taken off of the Index and is and has for centuries been considered by Romanists and Protestants as the ablest anti-Protestant work. It is a four-volumed quarto work. The fact that the Lutherans were in error on the point that one's faith justification admitted him to heaven, and their not seeing that carrying out one's consecration—a matter of good works—was the condition of his entering heaven, gave Roman controversialists a certain vantage point, which they improved to the utmost against the pertinent erroneous view of the Lutherans. But on the subject of justification by faith alone, which relates to the humanity, not to the New Creature, the Lutherans had the Truth and triumphantly refuted every argument against it advanced by their papal opponents.

(17) When the papists argued that justification means to make right, and that therefore it is by good works, antitypical Elishama replied that on this subject the word *justification* suggests a court scene and is used in a judicial sense, and therefore means to *declare* or *reckon* right, not to *make* right (Prov. 17: 15; Ex. 23: 7; Deut. 25: 1; Is. 5: 23; Rom. 4: 3-8, 11, 22-24). When the papists argued that by the works of the law, through which one is not justified, St. Paul meant the ceremonial law as distinct from the ten commandments, antitypical Elishama answered that the ceremonial law in its sacrifices typically justified and did not condemn. Moreover he proved that the moral law—the law of love—set forth in the ten commandments was the law that St. Paul meant when he showed that by the works of the law man could not be justified (Rom. 7: 5-8; 3: 10-20; the examples of acts here cited come under the ten commandments, not under the ceremonial law). When the papists argued that the very nature of good works is to justify, antitypical Elishama answered: (1) that the religious works of the heathen—supposedly good works—provoked God's wrath and effected not His justifying but His condemning them (Rom. 1: 19-25, 32); (2) that the man-made so-called good works of God's nominal people do not bring justification, but disapproval from God (Matt. 15: 9; Is. 1: 12); (3) that living according to the law of nature on the part of the unjustified does not justify before God, it being imperfect (Rom. 2: 14, 15; 3: 9, 19); and (4) that the best efforts of those under the law failed to justify them (Matt. 5: 20; Acts 13: 39; Rom. 3: 19, 20; Gal. 3: 10-12) . When the papists asserted that God would not have given the law as a means of gaining life, if man could not keep it, antitypical Elishama answered that God Himself said that imperfect man could not keep the perfect law and by it gain life (Rom. 3: 19, 20; 8: 68; Gal. 3: 10-12, 21; Acts 13: 39), because the perfect

law is the full measure of a perfect man's ability, and therefore is beyond the ability of one less than perfect, and that God gave the law for other reasons, especially that man might come to a knowledge of sin and his inability to save himself (Rom. 3: 20; 7: 7-13), feel the need of a Savior (Rom. 7: 15-24) and have the law lead him to the Savior (Gal. 3: 24). When the papists objected that faith, which they defined as belief, could not justify, antitypical Elishama proved that their definition of faith was false, since Scripturally faith is mental appreciation and heart's reliance (Heb. 11: 1) , and proved that God asserted that such a faith does justify (Rom. 3: 21—5: 1). When the papists objected that righteousness of one could not justify another, antitypical Elishama proved that it could (Rom. 3: 25-28; 4: 3-8, 11, 22-24; 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Phil. 3: 9), and that as logically as the sin of one could condemn another (Rom. 5: 12-19; 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22).

(18) When the papists argued that God would not allow the Church to err on justification or on any other subject, antitypical Elishama answered that God had never promised to keep even the true Church, let alone the Romish Church, free from error, but that He had foretold that under Antichrist's manipulations the Roman Church would greatly err (2 Thes. 2: 4-11; Rev. 13: 1-10; 17: 3-6; 18: 2-24; 19: 2, 3) . When the papists quoted those passages that show good works must be performed, if one would obtain the kingdom, antitypical Elishama answered that they belonged, not to justification, but to sanctification, which was true, but which did not explain these passages in harmony with his thought that justification entitles one to a heavenly inheritance apart from good works, which he insisted resulted from a true justifying faith and which evidenced it as such. While this answer vindicated justification by faith, it did not vindicate their view that faith justification, which pertains to the humanity,

entitles one to the eternal heavenly inheritance, a thing of the New Creature. When the papists claimed that Christ's merit does not in justification secure for us the satisfaction of God's justice, and thus the forgiveness of sins from God, but that it secures for us the infusion of charity by which we are made just, antitypical Elishama showed that the infusion of charity belongs to sanctification which comes after justification (Rom. 12: 1, 2; 6: 7, 3-16, 13-22; Gal. 5: 22-25; Eph. 5: 9; Col. 3: 1, 12-14), and showed that Christ's merit satisfies God's justice and thus secures forgiveness for us (Matt. 20: 28; 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6; 2 Cor. 5: 18, 19; Eph. 1: 7; 2: 13-16; Col. 1: 14, 20-22; 2 14; Rom. 3: 22-26; 4: 6-8, 25; 5: 8-11; Heb. 7: 27; 9: 11-15, 22, 24, 26; 10: 12, 18, 19; 13: 12; 1 John 1: 7—2: 2; 4: 10) . When Catholic theologians insisted that the Catholic doctrine on this subject be accepted, as being the doctrine of God's infallible "channel," antitypical Elishama declared that that "channel" not getting its waters from the reservoir of Truth—the Bible—must be getting them from the swamp of error, and therefore could not be the channel whose teachings are pure and therefore should be accepted (Gal. 1: 6-9; Is. 8: 20; Acts 5: 29; John 17: 17; 2 Tim. 3: 15-17) . From these standpoints and from every other standpoint unanswerably did antitypical Elishama refute every argument that was urged against the doctrine of justification by faith, and thus he offered the antitypical bowl.

(19) Finally, he offered the antitypical spoon filled with incense—instructions in righteousness: He used this doctrine to incite his hearers to honor God for His grace to man and to honor Christ for His ministry for man. He used it to reveal God's wisdom, justice, love and power, and thus sought to arouse his hearers to the faith that implicitly trusts God, to the hope that desires and expects blessings from Him, to the love that thanks and appreciates Him for the good He does

and is, and to the obedience that delights to serve Him as the one who deserves their obedience. He used it to comfort the distressed and believing sinner. He applied it to stimulate self-control in temptation and patience amid obstacles to well doing. He made it the basis of exhortations to consecration. He preached it to strengthen the weak and faint. He held it up as the foundation of peace with God and the peace of faith. He presented it as the source and stimulus to joy. He based upon it exhortations to forgive as freely as God forgives. He used it to stimulate parents to greater kindness and longsuffering toward their children, especially to wayward ones, and to stimulate laborers for others' salvation to more compassion. He formed from it the ground of many an exhortation to longsuffering and forbearance. It was used by him to influence people to greater love for sinners, as being such as God loves, and as Christ died for, and thus to greater evangelistic efforts. The fact that it implies man's inability to make himself acceptable to God antitypical Elishama used to incite to humility on the part of his hearers. He used it, as revealing God's liberality, as an incitement to greater liberality for others. He employed it as an exhortation to practice righteousness, inasmuch as that would make one more in harmony with the righteousness imputed to him. He utilized it to incite to courage manward, inasmuch as in its possessors all was confidence Godward. He applied it to give courage in the face of death, since Christ's merit would free them' in due time from death. He used it to enkindle love for the brotherhood, similarly blessed by justification. He utilized it to incite to hatred of sin, since it slew the Lord, whose grace so greatly blesses. Thus he applied this doctrine as a powerful instruction in righteousness.

(20) Fittingly did this doctrine give the Lutheran Church the chief place in the camp to the West of the antitypical Tabernacle—the direction of justice; for the

doctrine of faith justification, more effectively than all other teachings, harmonizes with, clarifies and glorifies God's justice, as it also remarkably exhibits His wondrous wisdom and love. And let us rejoice that the crown-lost leaders of the Lutheran Church have so ably, continually and fruitfully set forth the corrections of misconduct, refutations of error and instructions in righteousness pertinent to the glorious doctrine of justification by faith.

(21) The next set of princely offerings that we are to consider is that of the Congregational crown-lost leaders—typed by Gamaliel, the son of Pedahzur, the prince of Manasseh. The significance of his name and his father's name shows his office. The word, Gamaliel, means *the recompense of God*, indicative of the fact that an advocate of a right order of church government will not get a reward from the clericalists, but will from God, while at the same time his teachings will be God's recompense—spiritual punishment—on clericalists. The word, Pedahzur, means *the deliverer is a rock—strong*, indicative of the strength of the Scripture arguments that the Congregational crown-lost leaders used in delivering saints from all clerical bondage into the Divine order of church government. In studying the Jacob type in the generating of his sons, we noted the fact that Manasseh being a son of Joseph and not of Jacob, the Congregational Church is not represented by a particular son of Jacob, but comes under the type of Judah—the type of the Calvinistic churches. This is appropriate, because apart from church government the Congregationalists have been thoroughly Calvinistic in their doctrines and practices. Moreover, their church government principle has been accepted by the Baptists, Unitarians, Christians, Adventists and by large sections of the Lutheran Church, as we have shown above. But in the tabernacle picture the Lord has used Manasseh to type the Congregational Church.

(22) The Church is organized. Yea, according to the Scriptural figure of a human body as illustrating its organization, we are warranted in calling it an organism. In this organism the Lord Jesus is Head and the rest of the Faithful are the Body. But the figure is much more detailed, the general outlines of which are given in the spine. The spine consists of (1) the seven cervicals, (2) the twelve dorsals and (3) five lumbars, one sacrum and one coccyx. We understand the seven cervicals, which connect the head and body, to represent the seven angels of the seven churches, the seven connecting links between the Lord and the Church in its seven stages. We understand the twelve dorsals and their twelve sets of ribs to represent the twelve Apostles and the twelve tribes of which the Church consists, each tribe being in the Lord led by an Apostle. We understand the five lumbars, the one sacrum and the one coccyx to represent the Church in its seven stages: the five lumbars, the Church in the five stages between the two harvests; the sacrum, the Ephesus stage; and the coccyx, the Laodicean stage; and the five features of the one sacrum and of the one coccyx to symbolize that these two churches consist largely of the five groups united in one, called in the five call periods of the Jewish and Gospel Harvests, and tested by the five harvest siftings. The right arm and hand represent respectively the Christ's members in their power of expounding and defending the Truth and of serving in such work. The left arm and hand represent respectively the Christ's members in their power of refuting error and of serving in such work. The right leg and foot represent respectively the Christ's members in their power of right living and in their practice of right living. The left leg and foot represent respectively the Christ's members in their power of overcoming wrong conduct and in their practice of such overcoming. The feet considered apart

from the legs picture the last members. These are the generalities of this organism.

(23) Dropping the figure, we might say that Jesus governs the Church as its Monarch; and that He uses as His servants to minister to the Church: (1) apostles, (2) prophets, (3) evangelists and (4) pastors or teachers. But these servants are not the lords of the general Church, nor of particular ecclesias. Accordingly, the apostles and prophets are not lords over the general Church, nor lords over local churches, as the evangelists are not lords of the babes that they beget, and as pastors or teachers are not lords over a local church. These brethren, instead of being lords, are servants of the Church, the former two sets, of the general Church; of the latter two sets, the first, of the babes that they beget, and the second, of the local churches. On invitation from a local church the former two sets could minister to it. The second class of the latter two sets are limited in their service to local churches, while the evangelists work on outsiders to bring them into the body. Thus the Lord Jesus alone is the Lord of the Church, the Head of the Body, the general Church, as He alone is also the Head of the local churches. Apart from His use of the Apostles and that Servant in a ruling capacity as His special representatives, His use of representatives is for *servant* and not *rulership* purposes, both in the general Church and in local churches. He has not given the general Church the rulership over local churches, nor has He given any local church the rulership over other local churches or over the general Church. Apart from the thirteen persons above-mentioned, who had certain delegated ruling powers under Christ in the general Church, Jesus made each church free from the rulership of every other church, and free under His headship to manage all its own affairs according to its understanding of His will. This makes each ecclesia mistress in its own midst, subject to its understanding

of the Lord's will. This makes Christ the monarch of each ecclesia in its relation to Him and makes each ecclesia a democracy as respects itself and other persons, ecclesias or ecclesiastical organizations. According to the above, the Lord used the twelve Apostles to bind and loose as to all churches and the general Church and to manage the work toward and of the general Church. And He used that Servant to interpret all things so bound and loosed and to manage the work of and toward the general Church. This they severally did in their respective Harvests as antitypical Eleazar. The Lord has used other specially authorized servants to give the meat in due season, but not to manage the work toward and of the Little Flock, though they have by Him been used with pertinent authority in the work toward the justified, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies.

(24) In the two foregoing paragraphs we have given a brief description of the organization of the Church, general and local, and have explained briefly the polity or church government that is of Divine authority for the general Church and for local churches. In so doing we have, among other things, touched on the things that constitute the stewardship doctrine of the Congregational Church. That stewardship doctrine may be defined as follows: Each ecclesia of the Lord's people is, under Christ's Headship, the mistress of its own affairs, in complete independence of all other persons; ecclesias and ecclesiastical organizations, but acknowledges its ties with others in Christ for Christian fellowship and helpfulness. This doctrine we consider to be a Scriptural truth. It acknowledges that in a sense each ecclesia is an absolute monarchy—Christ being its absolute Ruler. It acknowledges in another sense—in the mutual relations of its constituent members as a company of saints—that it is under Christ a pure democracy, ruling its affairs by the unanimity or majority of its members. It rejects all external parties, be they

individuals, churches or a combination of churches or leaders, from the right and practice of dictation or rulership in its affairs, though it welcomes other Christian individuals and churches in Christian fellowship and oneness with them in Christ and stands ready to help them in the Lord. This doctrine is briefly comprehended in the expression, Congregationalism or Ecclesiaism, one a Latin, the other a Greek derivative.

(25) This doctrine is capable of Scripture proof. It is an undoubted fact that the ecclesias formed by the Apostles managed their own affairs and that at the direction of Jesus and the Apostles who, among other things, were obligated to "bind" a proper church government on the ecclesias. The Apostles in exercising this binding power advised and sanctioned their electing their own officers: (1) the deacons-the seven deacons (Acts 6: 1-6) and the deacons of the churches to collect and carry their contributions to the poor saints at Jerusalem (2 Cor. 8: 19, 23; *cheirotoneo*, here translated "chosen," means elected by stretching forth the hand); and (2) elders (Acts 14: 23; here *cheirotoneo* is mistranslated "ordained"). The churches, under St. Paul's advice, decided matters of business, *i.e.*, to contribute to the poor saints and to appoint the agents to administer the collection and delivery of the money (2 Cor. 8: 1-24). Hence under apostolic sanction the churches decided their business matters. Again, at Christ's charge (Matt. 18: 15-17) the administration of discipline is in the hands of the ecclesia, and St. Paul's accepted exhortation to the Corinthians unanimously to apply discipline to the incestuous brother (1 Cor. 5: 1-13) proves that that Church exercised discipline. Its later receiving by vote this brother when repentant (2 Cor. 2: 5-10) proves that the Church decided whether it should fellowship people or not. The ecclesias also sent out missionaries (Acts 13: 1-3). These five facts—(1) the churches' electing their elders and deacons, (2) transacting business, (3)

exercising discipline, (4) receiving people into fellowship and (5) sending out missionaries, all under the Lord's and the Apostles' sanction—prove that under the Lord each ecclesia is the manager of its own affairs. This doctrine is also proven by the doctrine of the priesthood of consecrated believers (1 Pet. 2: 5, 9), which implies the equal priestly rights of the individual members of an ecclesia, and the consequent right of their settling their common interests by unanimity or majority, *i.e.*, congregational rule. This doctrine is also true because it leads better than any other method of church government to the Divinely sanctioned development of the Christlike qualities required in the Lord's people in their relations to one another (Rom. 8: 29; 12: 2-8). Thus each ecclesia is by Divine institution a democracy in its government, yielding equal rights to all its members before the bar of church law, which facts are thoroughly compatible with the diversity in talent, attainment, function, etc., had by the various members of an ecclesia; even as the democracy of America is compatible with the diversity of talent, attainment, function, etc., in the American citizens, all of whom have, theoretically at least, equal rights before the law. It is this theoretical and practical recognition of the equal rights of the members of an ecclesia in church government, on the basis of the priesthood of its consecrated members, for which the Congregational Church stands, that has given it a standing at the antitypical West of the antitypical Tabernacle—it stands for *Justice* as its central doctrinal thought.

(26) The Little Flock brother through whom the Lord restored the Truth on each ecclesia's being under Christ's headship the manager of its own affairs in entire independence of outside persons, ecclesias or ecclesiastical bodies and leaders, and thus initiated the movement that was perverted into the Congregational Church, was Robert Browne. He was born three miles

north of Stamford, Rutlandshire, England, about 1550, and died at Northampton in 1631. He came from a good family, which included such relations as the great Chancellor, Lord Burghley. He entered Corpus Christi College, a part of the Cambridge University, about 1568, and became B.A. in 1572. He taught school for three years, and made enemies by pointing out the fallen state of the Anglican Church. In 1578 he returned to Cambridge for further study and became a member of Richard Greenham's family, an eminently devout Puritan minister, who taught theology to him and encouraged him to preach. As a preacher he soon became eminent and was invited to accept one of the Cambridge pulpits. This he declined on the ground that he did not believe in Episcopal ordination and therefore would not submit to it. His pertinent mental conflicts broke down his weak bodily health. The religious formalism of his day distressed him and he greatly desired fellowship with truly consecrated people. He said of himself: "He had no rest what he might do for the name and kingdom of God. He often complained of these evil days, and with many tears sought where to find the righteous who glorify God, with whom he might live and rejoice together that they put away abomination." After his recovery he heard that there were such believers in Norfolk. Thither he went and remained some months, all the while studying the Bible and praying for light as to the way out of the formalism of the Church of England. These studies and prayers were blessed with the light that a true church consisted of consecrated believers, that its governmental powers were those of a democracy free from the dictation of outside persons, churches or groups of churches or leaders. This led him with some kindred spirits to form such a church at Norwich in 1580. He unfolded his views along the lines of what we gave above as the Bible teachings on the governmental powers of an ecclesia. With the thought of mutual help on the part of

the brethren he made the mistake of introducing the custom of having regular ecclesia meetings for the members to criticize one another's faults; but this custom greatly injured all concerned. Had he introduced testimony meetings, the reverse effect would have set in.

(27) Naturally, such a theory of church government meant separation from the State-Church. Elizabeth was then on England's throne. As we saw above, she did not require as the law of the land uniformity of belief and teaching, but did require uniformity of church membership and worship, enforced by civil penalties. This law led to the persecution of Bro. Browne and his associates, who separated themselves from the State-Church and did not use the book of Common Prayer, the service which was and is in use in the Episcopal Church. Browne was penalized in no less than 32 prisons, in some of which he could not see his hand held before his face at noonday. These persecutions drove the little church to emigrate in a body to Holland, where they settled at Middelberg. Here they had freedom of faith and practice, so far as the State was concerned; and all went well with them for a time. Here Browne wrote several treatises strongly expounding and proving his doctrine on Church Democracy under Christ as Head. The pressure of hard times and the mutual criticism meetings by and by wrecked the congregation. Browne resigned his pastorate, and with a handful of followers returned to England by way of Scotland, in 1583. Soon afterward Browne ruined his Truth influence and compromised his movement by rejoining the Episcopal Church, which he did without Episcopal ordination and without repudiation of his principles, in some manner allowed this freedom through the influence of his uncle, Lord Burghley. There seems to be some reason to think that years of ill health, rigorous imprisonments, troubles in his Holland Church and the outbreak of fresh persecutions in England weakened his mind and made him "practically

to a degree insane and sometimes wholly irresponsible." His writings on his special truth before this had been widely circulated in England, and when as many of them as could be found were in 1583 collected and burned at the hanging of two of his associates, Copping and Thacker, the authorities thereby indicated their belief that there was a considerable response to them on the part of the people. And persecution followed every revival of this movement for nearly a century.

(28) In ultimate analysis, Bro. Browne's teachings were a setting forth of the Truth on church government in opposition to papal error on that subject; but it was more than this. It was a protest against all the clericalistic forms of church government that have prevailed during the Gospel Age. It was a restoration of the original Apostolic form of church government to the Lord's people, so long lost to them. Thus it struck at the great apostasy's first wrong step with its further developments; for let us not forget that clericalism in the form of what later was called Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism were the first external workings of the great apostacy in church government, as its first secret working was the unholy ambition of certain leaders to become great among the brethren (2 Thes. 2: 7). It will help us to a better appreciation of the offerings of the Congregational Church's crown-lost leaders, if we consider step by step the apostacy in church government—the tree—trunk of all other branches of the great apostacy, the roots being the unholy ambition of certain leaders to become "somebodies." The constitution of the local churches in that they had elders as leaders became the point of departure for this apostasy's start. The Scriptural ideal is that these local elders are servants of the Lord and of the ecclesia, chosen by the Lord through the ecclesia's vote, not to lord it over, but to serve the ecclesia. During most of the Ephesian period of the Church, the

warm love of the brethren for the Lord, the Truth and one another, expressing itself in much missionary activity, mutual upbuilding and relief of one another's earthly needs, and the faithful oversight of the Apostles, confined the ambition of the power-hungry leaders to the secret recesses of their own hearts. The Apostles forecast and warned against the great apostacy itself, *e.g.*, St. Paul in Acts 20: 28-31, which, however, did not begin to show itself externally until after all the Apostles except St. John had passed away. St. John recounts some of the first external acts of this apostacy in connection with Diotrephes' [foster child of Jupiter—Satan] power-grasping activities (3 John 9, 10). Of course, during the five siftings of the Jewish Harvest there were more or less power-grasping acts committed by the sifters; but these were as sifters separated from the brethren, and are not included in the apostolically predicted great apostacy, which St. Paul foretold would come after his departure, which presumably occurred in 66 or 67 A. D., after the five siftings were over.

(29) Now to a description of the unfolding of the apostacy in church government: The apostolic churches as a rule had more than one elder or bishop—names Biblically interchangeable for the same persons (Acts 13: 1; 14: 23; 15: 2, 22; 20: 17, 28; Tit. 1: 5-7; also seen from the fact that bishops and deacons were the two kinds of church servants, Phil. 1: 1; 1 Tim. 3: 1, 10, 12, 13). These elders or bishops differed in talent, devotion and usefulness (Rom. 12: 6-8), and thus in the esteem in which they were held, and in the influence that they exerted (1 Tim. 5: 17). This is in perfect harmony with the Lord's will; for He so ordained matters both as to the local elders in a local ecclesia and as to the general elders in the general Church. Moreover, the body of elders in their meetings for counseling over church matters, because of such superior talents, devotion and usefulness, gave greater esteem to

their possessor than to the other elders, and this again was proper. And thus gradually this particular elder began to be regarded as the first one among equals, and this, too, was proper and good, as implied by the principle contained in 1 Tim. 5: 17 and expressed in the greater uses the Lord makes of some than of others. This led as a rule to this particular elder being elected to the chairmanship of the elders' business meetings and the congregational business meetings. As such he was still only considered as the first among equals; and but little can be said against this, though it became the point of departure for later abuses. It would, however, have been better to have rotated alphabetically the chairmanship of the elders' meetings, as the Philadelphia Ecclesia's elders do, and to have elected for a period of time to the chairmanship of congregational meetings a less prominent elder, as the Philadelphia Ecclesia does. Soon, in the early part of the Smyrna Church, this most prominent elder or bishop began to be called by way of emphasis, *the* elder or *the* bishop, as distinct from other elders or bishops. In the New Testament the latter name, which refers to the burden of the service, and the former name, which refers to the honor of the service, apply to one and the same office incumbents (Acts 20: 17, 28, the Greek for "overseers" being the word for *bishops*). The word *bishop*, however, began to be used increasingly and finally exclusively of the most prominent elder. Henceforth he alone was *the* bishop and was considered in office function over the other elders. This change of view, of course, was not made everywhere at one and the same time, nor without much opposition of the elders; but before the end of the second century it was practically general among the churches; for it was thought necessary, in order better to edify the church, to present a stronger front to the world and more powerfully to refute errorists, thus to put forward the ablest and most influential elder. If we should consider

some of the better attested epistles of Ignatius of Antioch genuine, this distinction was advocated by Ignatius for the church at Antioch, Smyrna and some other Asiatic places by 108 or 116 A. D., when Ignatius is said to have written these epistles on his way to Rome for martyrdom. But the so-called Ignatian epistles come to us in larger (15) and smaller (7) and smallest (3) numbers, the seven in longer and shorter forms, and the three in still shorter forms, and all of them with such greatly variant readings, that if any of them are genuine, their numerous interpolations greatly reduce their credibility, as witness on the subject before us, as well as on numerous other subjects. The *pros* and *cons* among devout scholars are nearly even on the genuineness of the better attested of these epistles—the shorter seven and the three. Hence they are not of certain weight as evidence of the condition of pertinent matters in 108 or 116 A. D. According to the better attested of these epistles (which are likely genuine), by 108 or 116 A. D. the viewpoint that Ignatius is alleged to have advocated was that *the* bishop was Christ's representative and the elders were the Apostles' representatives; and he especially emphasizes the necessity of obeying the bishop. But the progress of this error on the interrelation of elders and bishops was quite varied at different times and in different localities at the same time. In 251 A. D. Cyprian, in his book on the Unity of the Church, began to teach the doctrine that the bishops are successors of the Apostles, and that each one is a ruler over the presbyters in his Church; but as yet he did not exercise full power over the ecclesia. And this view gradually spread, and as it spread, increased the powers of the bishops, until in the fourth century the bishops were regarded not only as the ruler of the presbyters, but also largely of the ecclesias which elected him.

(30) But side by side with the misdevelopment just described was another misgrowth, which, indeed, began

even a little earlier than the one just described. The one just outlined is the Episcopal development in the separate ecclesias as distinct from one another; for the bishops in Cyprian's time and previously were not diocesan, but local church bishops, because in Cyprian's time the apostacy in church government had not yet developed the diocesan bishop, who arose, however, very shortly afterward. Thus we see that the bishops robbed the elders of certain of their rights; but previous to the bishop's advancing spoliation of the elders, the elders were making spoil of the congregation's rights (3 John 9, 10), by establishing slowly and by degrees the rulership of the elders over the church, and thus gradually transacting the business that the churches formerly transacted. Thus the resolutions of the board of elders became more and more encroachments on the church's prerogatives, and were acted on as decisions to be executed, whereas they should at most have been used as recommendations to the ecclesia for acceptance or rejection, as might seem good to the church. They also spread the view that as elders they were in a different class—a ruling, "ruling elders," instead of a serving class—from the other brethren, and hence slowly and by degrees they took to themselves one prerogative after another from the ecclesia until by the time the diocesan bishop began to function, the presbyters, now called priests, ruled the ecclesia as formerly the local bishop had done. After they had begun partially to deprive the churches of their rights, Episcopal usurpations began to deprive them of their proper and their usurped ecclesial powers, which later were relinquished to the elders when the ecclesial bishops became diocesan bishops.

(31) Astonished, we ask, What opiate did they use on the ecclesias that enabled them to quiet these while they usurped their rights? We reply, They used a variety of means to this end. First and worst, after introducing an unbiblical distinction between the elders

and the ecclesias, they gradually set aside the doctrine of the priesthood of all the consecrated and substituted in its stead the doctrine of the clergy, quasi-clergy [deacons and the incumbents of many newly made offices] and laity, by which they meant, and deceived the brethren into believing, that only the clergy were priests, the quasi-clergy were Levites and the laity were antitypical Israelites as distinct from antitypical priests and Levites. To quiet the objections of more or less subordinately prominent brethren, they called the deacons and a host of incumbents of many subordinate offices that they invented, "Levites," thus counterfeiting the real antitypical Priests, Levites and Israelites. This led to the exaltation of the clergy to power and influence, to the measurable exaltation of the quasi-clergy over the laity and to their measurable degradation under the clergy, and to the complete degradation of the laity under the clergy and quasi-clergy. Again, we remark, this misdevelopment was not everywhere contemporaneous and equal. It was in some places more advanced than in other places. While it began in the latter part of the second century, it was not general nor was it complete anywhere until just after the middle of the third century, *i.e.*, after the phenomenon of diocesan bishops as distinct from congregational bishops began to make its appearance.

(32) This brings us to discuss very briefly another misdevelopment: The bringing of the churches into the union of an external body, first in the districts, then in the provinces, then in pluro-provinces—prefectures—of the Roman Empire, resulting finally in an externally organized Catholic Church, world-wide, under the pope. The point of departure for this error was the common need of help from one another on the part of various churches under the stress of doctrinal and practical difficulties. Such doctrinal and practical difficulties, *e.g.*, led the Antioch Ecclesia to send delegates to Jerusalem to confer on the subject with the

Apostles, the elders and other brethren of the Jerusalem Church (Acts 15). This was perfectly proper; for sister churches in Christian fellowship should be willing to give help on request from a church in difficulties. Nor could there be any objection to the post-apostolic churches individually in their doctrinal and practical difficulties giving help on the request of one another. But where these occasions were seized upon by one church, or a number of churches, to force upon an ecclesia, and that at times on pain of disfellowshipment, their ideas, whether they had been asked for them or not, they could not plead the example of the Antioch and Jerusalem churches, where no such thing occurred. In justification of organizing the churches in a body the bishops argued that in an external union there is strength, and that such a union was necessary to combat error, defend truth and promote growth; and therefore they formed the churches of a district into an external body. They impinged against the Lord's order of the independence of each local ecclesia from all others, especially when all of these so-united churches, through their bishops in synods and councils assembled, passed doctrinal decrees and practical laws, binding on all the churches in the district. No such union of congregations existed in the Apostolic days and no such synodical or conciliar assemblies of bishops took place in the primitive Church. About 170 the first synod of this character was held in Asia Minor to dogmatize and legislate on the Montanists' teachings and practices, which were disturbing the churches there. These synods or councils gradually increased and spread everywhere, from district to provincial, from provincial to a pluro-provincial and finally to ecumenical or universal councils, dogmatizing and legislating, even as in 325 A. D. at Nice, the first so-called ecumenical council was held and, among other things, decreed the Son's co-eternity, co-equality and consubstantiality with the Father, as doctrines that

had to be accepted by the churches and individuals on pain of anathema. And such so-called ecumenical councils were held to be infallible in their decrees. The unity of the Church was supposed to lodge in the bishops who, assembled in an ecumenical council, spoke infallibly in successorship of the Apostles as God's direct mouthpiece and as for the universal Church. Thus was the apostolic independence of the local ecclesias destroyed, and in the place of the original spiritual unity of the general Church, based on the one spirit, hope, mission, Lord, faith, baptism and God, there was substituted an external union, based on an episcopate of alleged apostolic succession.

(33) So far we have traced the apostacy in church government unto its development into an episcopate yin supposed apostolic succession over the elders; into an elderate and episcopate as a priesthood ruling over the churches, consisting of counterfeit antitypical Levites and Israelites; into the subordination of the local churches to an external organization in which the churches were parts; and into the bishops in councils assembled, dogmatizing and legislating for district, provincial, pluro-provincial and world-wide churches. But this is not all. A further part of the misdevelopment under study was the rise of diocesan bishops. This came about in a rather natural way, supposedly necessitated by a proper subjection of daughter churches to their mother churches. At first somewhat like nominal-church pastors of our day each of the supposed apostolic bishops had charge of but one church, which, in a large city, usually had one meeting place for the main services and subordinate meeting places for the less important services. *E.g.*, Cyprian, as bishop of Carthage, had but one central church for the whole congregation, where it met for the main services; but for less important services there were chapels in various parts of the city, wherein his presbyters by his and the congregation's appointment led

various meetings, just as we have various meetings in our larger churches. Thus the Philadelphia Church has three prayer meetings in various sections of the city, as it also has various study meetings in different parts of the city. But Sundays all assemble in a central meeting place. From this we see that before the diocesan bishop appeared, the bishop was somewhat like the pastor of a city church, with or without branch churches, who had several assistant pastors under him.

(34) But the diocesan bishop was a step further on in the apostacy from that which brought in the ecclesial bishop. It arose as follows: The brethren of a city church would evangelize the surrounding country, including towns, villages, etc. In the churches thus formed the presbyters of the city church under the direction and appointment of the city bishop would minister as elders, and by and by as each of these new churches would become larger, one of the ministering presbyters from the city church would be chosen by the new church as a sort of an assistant bishop (*chore-piscopos*, country bishop), subordinate to the city bishop. Thus in time these assistant bishoprics would increase and an ecclesiastical district would develop, all of whose assistant bishops were under the direction of the city bishop. All these churches under the city bishop would thus come to constitute a diocese, and the bishop over these churches was thus a diocesan bishop. Following 325 A. D. the country bishops lost their position as such and became the pastors (priests) of the churches where they ministered under the rulership of the diocesan bishop.

(35) The next stage of the apostasy in organization was the creation of metropolitans, the bishops of the provincial capital cities who claimed and exercised authority over the diocesan bishops. Such metropolitans came into existence sometime before, but were not called such until at the Nicean Council, 325 A. D. To them was granted the right to call and preside over

provincial synods and to appoint and to ordain the bishops of their provinces. Thus each metropolitan had as his sphere of authority an entire province and was over all diocesan bishops of that province, *e.g.*, the metropolitan of Alexandria was over all the diocesan bishops of Egypt, who functioned under him.

(36) Late in the reign of Constantine the Great, the Roman Empire was divided into four prefectures, and later another was formed of Palestine and Arabia. The metropolitans of the five capitals of these prefectures were given the title of patriarch (*chief father*, formerly the title of any bishop). At first there were but three of these, the bishops of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria, as residence places of Apostles (apostolic seats). These were given these titles at the Council of Nice in 325, before Constantine formed the four prefectures. The Roman bishop refusing to have a title in common with others, declined the title and appropriated as exclusively his the title, pope (papa, father), which formerly was the title of every bishop. In 381 A. D., at the ecumenical Council of Constantinople, the bishop of Constantinople (because, as the new capital of the Roman Empire, it was called New Rome) was added as the fourth of these patriarchs, taking second rank among them, immediately following the bishop of Rome in rank. Just after the Council of Ephesus, 431 A. D., the bishop of Jerusalem as having an apostolic seat, was added as the fifth of these patriarchs. The Saracen conquests destroyed the patriarchate at Jerusalem in 637 A. D., that of Antioch in 638 A. D. and that at Alexandria in 640 A. D. The patriarch was over all the metropolitans and bishops of the respective prefecture in his part of the Roman Empire, exercising supreme authority there, and at the head of his patriarchal synod decided all the affairs of the churches of the pertinent prefecture. Some of the metropolitans however, *e.g.*, those of Salamis, Milan, Aquileia and Ravenna were independent of the patriarchs.

(37) Onward from the Council of Chalcedon, 451 A. D., the patriarch of Constantinople (New Rome) was constantly in controversy with the bishop of (old) Rome for equality. But the principles as to primacy already then accepted, Old Rome's greater prestige, the pope's distance from the intrigues at the Court of the Emperor in New Rome, the decline of the Empire dating from shortly after the beginning of New Rome, the West's refusal to recognize the Contantinopolitan patriarch's claim, the fact that Constantinople was actually not an apostolic seat, the prestige of Rome as being looked upon as having the Church where Sts. Paul and Peter had lived, worked, suffered and were buried, Rome's being considered as having been the see of St. Peter, reputedly the chief of the Apostles, with the Roman bishop as his successor, the favor of the emperors of the West, whose needs made the powerful pope very influential with them, his almost unfailing so-called orthodoxy contrasted with the frequent heresies of his rival, the wanderings of the nations, the sufferings entailed on the West as their consequences, which were relieved greatly by the pope's practical ability, the unity and comparative tranquility of the Western Church contrasted with the distracting controversies and divisions in the Eastern Church, the controversialists frequently requesting the mediating activity of the pope, the eventual triumph of the parties favored by the pope in these controversies, the circumstances of the times, the popes always holding the fruits of their victories and conditions as pawns in the game that was being played, and the strict hierarchial party finding the pope an unfailing rallying point as seated in St. Peter's chair—are reasons that combined to defeat the ambition of the Constantinopolitan patriarch and to favor that of the pope, who therefore early in the sixth century was legally recognized as "the head of all the holy churches of God."

(38) Toward this headship step by step the pope

had advanced in ecclesiastical power for several centuries until late in the fifth and early in the sixth century he was everywhere by the State acknowledged as head of the Church. In 539 A. D. he could begin to exercise, first faintly and gradually more markedly, civil power along with supreme ecclesiastic power. In 799 A. D. he had so much political power that he could begin the counterfeit Millennial reign. Both phases of his power increasing, in Gregory VII (1073-1085) he could claim supremacy in State as well as in Church, in Innocent III (1198-1216) could actualize supremacy in State throughout Christendom, and in Pius IX (1870) could dictate through a so-called ecumenical council his absolute authority in Church and his infallibility when speaking officially as universal teacher of the Church. Thus the apostacy on organization reached its supreme climax, but it has also suffered a most humiliating eclipse in civil power, and through the reformation, first by individuals and then by sects, experienced a real limitation, as far as universality is concerned, in religious power.

(39) Throughout this whole exhibition of power-grasping and lording it over God's heritage, there runs an irony of retribution that is a partial punishment for the wrongs committed. The power-grasping and lording elders were punished by getting a bishop to lord it over them. The power-grasping and lording bishops were scourged by receiving the metropolitans or archbishops to tyrannize over them. These power-grasping and lording metropolitans had to accept the patriarchs, and later the cardinals, who were first constituted as such by Pope Nicholas II in 1059, to trample upon them. These power-grasping and lording patriarchs and the cardinals had to bow down to the exactions of the popes, who in turn, as the head of the Antichrist, have especially since 1295 (when real civil opposition set in), 1309 (when real religious opposition set in by individuals) and 1522 (when it set in by

sects) suffered one humiliation and loss after another, until in 1870 they lost the last shred of temporal power, which we do not expect them to get again on a large scale, the spoliation of their religious powers increasing almost apace throughout the world. In nature every pest has its pest. The dissatisfied frogs indeed got their king, but he proved to be a stork! Israel dissatisfied with Jehovah as King received an increasingly oppressive Saul as King. The stewardship doctrine of the Congregational Church is a protest against every phase of the power-grasping and lording tactics of elders, bishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, cardinals and popes, and hence is a spiritual punishment to all of them. It is necessary to see the fearful misdevelopment, briefly sketched above, against the doctrine of an ecclesia's right, under the Lord, of ruling in its own midst and of remaining independent of other persons, ecclesias and ecclesiastical bodies and leaders, if we are properly to appreciate the Truth, and the consequent significance of the movement inaugurated by Bro. Robert Browne and sectarianized by the crown-lost leaders of the Congregational Church—antitypical Gamaliel; for the Browne movement was a complete return to apostolic teaching and practice on an ecclesia's democracy in its autonomy and in its independence from outsiders.

(40) About 1589 Barrows and Greenfield appeared in England and began to sectarianize the movement begun by Bro. Browne. They introduced a perversion, which made their teaching a cross between real Congregationalism and Presbyterianism—the ecclesia could do whatever it pleased *subject to the veto of the elders*—and thus betrayed their power—grasping tendencies and their fitness for crown-losing. Their view was advocated a little later by Johnson and Ainsworth and by that Robinson who was pastor of the church many of whose members constituted the pilgrims who landed at Plymouth, Mass., 1620. In America the same view

was advanced in New England Congregationalism for a century by Goodwin, Cotton, Hooker, Davenport, the Mathers, etc. But this leaven of Presbyterianism was cast out by John Wise of Ipswich, Mass. (1652-1725) and Nathaniel Emmons of Franklin, Mass. (1745-1840), who with irresistible logic Scripturally vindicated the pure congregational principle as we have given it above. Henry Martyn Dexter, of Boston (1821-1890), may be cited as one of the ablest and leading later Congregationalist advocates of congregationalism as taught by Browne. These are the chief ones of the crown-lost leaders of the Congregational Church, all of whom are typed by Gamaliel, the son of Pedahzur, whose offerings in antitypical charger, bowl and spoon we will now briefly explain, remarking that within the last 75 years they have vitiated some of their principles, *e.g.*, forming the congregations into a loose-fitting denominational organization with denominational officers and creed.

(41) In offering his charger antitypical Gamaliel had to show how the doctrine of an ecclesia's democracy in its autonomy and in its independence from all outside persons, ecclesias and ecclesiastical organizations, under Christ, corrects misconduct and bad qualities. It certainly rebukes and corrects power-grasping; for it cuts off its exercise whenever it operates in an elder of an ecclesia. It rebukes and corrects the misconduct of bishops who lord it over ecclesias and their servants. It rebukes and corrects the misconduct of a metropolitan who lords it over bishops, elders and ecclesias. It rebukes and corrects it whenever a patriarch or cardinal lords it over metropolitans, bishops, elders and ecclesias; and it rebukes and corrects the pope in his lording it over civil and religious officials, non-officials and organizations. The pride and ambition of power-graspers find in it a standing rebuke and correction. It steadfastly protests against and corrects the sins of clerical usurpation, rulership, tyranny,

superstition, self-exaltation, oppression and error, to which clericalism always leads. It rebukes and corrects the indifference to real spiritual things and interests that clericalism always produces in its practicers. It protests against and corrects the people's spoliation, degradation, ignorance, weakness, formalism, worldliness, servility and sufferings that clericalism always produces. It restrains and corrects the would-be position-seekers and power-graspers in an ecclesia, by keeping them out of office in an ecclesia and by demoting a church officer who clericalistically seeks "to run the church." It reproves and corrects all scheming to control the business, elections and disciplinary administration of the church on the part of any of its members, official or unofficial. It corrects the unbrotherliness of those who seek to overthrow, circumvent, limit or evade the ecclesia's democracy in its autonomy and independence. The covetousness of those who seek place, privilege and power in the Church it rebukes and corrects. The contentiousness and ruthlessness of party spirit in an ecclesia it denounces and corrects. The vanity of an office-and-popularity lover it rebukes and corrects. The insubordination of offenders against ecclesiaism to the Lord Jesus as absolute Monarch of an ecclesia it certainly corrects. Any unelderly or undeaconly conduct on the part of its officials as such it corrects. A lazy elder, a negligent deacon and an indifferent non-official member of the ecclesia it rebukes and corrects. In disciplinary administration it corrects for purposes of repentance, and in cases of impenitence it corrects by disfellowshipment. Thus the doctrine of the ecclesia's democracy in autonomy and independence under Christ corrects all opposing acts and qualities; and times innumerable in dealing with this doctrine antitypical Gamaliel has administered these and other pertinent corrections. Thus he offered his charger.

(42) So, too, has antitypical Gamaliel refuted all arguments against the doctrine that under Christ the

ecclesia is a democracy which exercises its autonomy, and which enjoys its independence from all outside persons, ecclesias and ecclesiastical organizations and leaders,—*i.e.*, offered his antitypical bowl. To the objection that an ecclesia cannot be safely entrusted with such powers, he has answered that under Christ's Headship it can, and under that Headship always eventually works out good results, better according to the Lord's plan than can be otherwise obtained. To the objection that ecclesiaism's exercise deprives it of the service of abler, more experienced and efficient men, available under a presbyterian, episcopal, patriarchal or papal church government, he has replied that the ecclesia can dispense with them as long as it is engaged in its Divinely given work, and that such church governments have always more or less led the churches away from their Divinely assigned task, and therefore are well gotten rid of. To the objection that such church polities are conducive to order and effectiveness, antitypical Gamaliel has answered that the order and effectiveness to which they are conducive are of the devil, the world and the flesh, and undermine the Divinely charged order and effectiveness. To the objection of the Presbyterians that, not congregational democracy in autonomy and independence are the Scriptural ideal, but a church-elected aristocracy consisting of elders, local and synodal, is the Scriptural ideal of church government, he has answered that the Scriptures teach that the apostolic ecclesias elected all their servants, transacted their business, exercised their discipline, expelled the impenitent, received them again on repentance, and managed their evangelistic work, and that therefore there was not an elderate aristocracy in charge of the churches, but that there was therein under Christ a democracy acting in autonomy and independence; and as for synodal elders, he answered that apostolic churches were alike ignorant of them and of the combination of churches implied in

synods and synodal elders. To the Presbyterian argument that their claimed aristocracy is Scripturally called by such names as imply an aristocracy [*proistamenoi*, presiding ones, *i.e.*, chairmen at business meetings, mistranslated by the word *rule* in A. V., Rom. 12: 8; 1 Thes. 5: 12; *hegoumenoi*, leaders, misrendered *rulers* in the A. V., Heb. 13: 7, 17, 24; *presbyteroi*, elders, Acts 20: 17, *episcopoi*, overseers, Acts 20: 28; *poimainein*, to shepherdize, *i.e.*, God's sheep, Acts 20: 28, 29; 1 Pet. 5: 2], he replied that such officers are perfectly consistent with an ecclesia's democracy, exercising autonomy and independence so long as they remain what God designs them to be—servants of, and do not become lords over, God's heritage (1 Pet. 5: 1-3).

(43) To the Episcopalian argument that such ecclesia's democracy, autonomy and independence is wrong because opposed to the doctrine of apostolic succession of bishops, antitypical Gamaliel replied: (1) the Apostles in binding the Divine doctrines and practices of the Gospel Age on the churches and loosing them from all others, exercised no lordship over them, but sanctioned without any interference whatever their electing their own officers, transacting their own business, administering their own discipline, expelling impenitent persons, receiving again the repentant and sending out their own missionaries; (2) historically the bishops cannot trace their succession back to the Apostles; (3) the doctrine of the apostolic succession is an error, not only not having the slightest basis in the Scriptures, but being expressly condemned therein (Rev. 2: 2; 21: 14); and (4) Cyprian in 251 was the first one to set forth the doctrine of the apostolic succession of bishops. To their claim that the bishop as the ruler of both the presbyters, and of the ecclesia, is the real head of the ecclesia, under the Lord, antitypical Gamaliel answered that the names, bishop (*episcopos*) and elder (*presbyteros*), are used interchangeably in

the Bible (Acts 20: 17, compare with verse 28; Tit. 1: 5, compare with verses 6-9, where he gives the qualifications for these elders, and uses of them the name bishop, for whose appointment Titus was to arrange, according to verse 5; 1 Tim. 3: 1-7, in giving the qualities of a bishop, says nothing further of elders, the following verses proceeding immediately to give the qualities of deacons; Phil. 1: 1, where St. Paul addresses the saints of the Church with the bishops [plural] and deacons, not mentioning the word elders, since they are identical with bishops in St. Paul's opinion; 1 Pet. 5: 2, 3, where St. Peter exhorts the elders *to act as bishops* [*episkopountes*], "take the oversight" being the A. V., an Episcopal translation). To the claims of metropolitans or archbishops, cardinals and patriarchs for their respective powers, antitypical Gamaliel answered: (1) that the Bible does not contain the slightest hint of such officials in the organization of the apostolic church; (2) that their claims fall to the ground with those of the bishops; and (3) that they are greater usurpers, power-graspers and lords over God's heritage than even the bishops. To the claims of the pope they gave the same answers as antitypical Eliasaph (the crown-lost leaders of the Episcopal Church; see Chap. V). Thus antitypical Gamaliel triumphantly refuted every objection to the Scriptural doctrine that under Christ's headship the ecclesia is a democracy, enjoying autonomy and independence from all outside persons, ecclesias and ecclesiastical organizations or leaders. So did he offer his bowl.

(44) Finally, antitypical Gamaliel offered his spoon, *i.e.*, instructions in righteousness. In doing this he showed that the doctrine that under Christ's headship the ecclesia is a democracy enjoying its own autonomy and its independence from all outside persons, ecclesias and ecclesiastical organizations or leaders, is conducive to righteousness; and he used this doctrine to

incite to righteousness. He showed that this doctrine was conducive to righteousness toward God; for it recognized and realizes God's arrangement for church government. He likewise showed that this doctrine helped on righteousness, because it recognizes and submits to Christ's leadership in all things unto the Church as His Body. Therefore he used this doctrine to induce the brethren into such recognition and acceptance of God's order for church government and into such recognition and submission of the brethren to Christ as their Head in all things in the Body. He also used this doctrine to inculcate proper recognition on the part of the brethren of one another as members of a priesthood having equal rights before God and toward one another in the ecclesia, such only enjoying special privileges as are by God through the ecclesia's vote designated thereto. He used this doctrine to inculcate to the elders the wholesome lesson that they were servants of, and not lords over, the ecclesia. Thereby he deepened their humility. He used this doctrine to sharpen each ecclesia-member's sense of responsibility in co-operating intelligently as an eye of the Lord and conscientiously as a hand of the Lord in the ecclesia's affairs, whether this be in electing officers, transacting business, administering discipline, withdrawing fellowship from those excommunicated for cause, accepting in forgiveness the repentant, or in sending out evangelists. He used this to increase brotherly love and care for one another as members of the same Body. He used it to indicate meekness, longsuffering and patience in view of differences of opinion as to what is the Lord's will. He used it to increase the brethren's love for and defense of the liberty wherewith Christ makes His priesthood fiee; as he also used it to increase their love to sacrifice in the interests of the Body, and to help all to recognize the unity of, diversity in, and mutuality of, the Body of Christ. He used it to stir up faith in the Lord's overrulership in all things in the ecclesia's affairs, and to incite to love and obedience

to law and order in the church. He used it to wean the brethren away from worldly arrangements for doing church work and to separate the brethren more and more unto that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. He used it to incite each church to become "a burning and shining light" in its own community and abroad in evangelistic zeal. And proportionately the Congregational Church has been in the forefront in evangelistic endeavors at home and abroad. He used this doctrine to arouse elders and the ecclesia to mutual love, sympathy, fellowship and help in their mutual relations. Fruitful indeed was this symbolic spoon in its instructions in righteousness. This spoon truly was full of sweet incense—the graces of the Spirit.

(45) It is surely a matter of gratification that this doctrine has overflown the banks of Congregationalism and has made fruitful the lands of some other denominations, like the Baptists, Unitario-Universalists, Christians, Adventists and many Lutheran bodies. It is not at all surprising that our Lord schooled in the Congregational Church as a boy him who became that Servant; as it is also gratifying to see how consistently he introduced among the Truth people this truth, both theoretically and practically. Since his death, among others, the P. B. I., and more especially the Society, have disastrously militated against this doctrinal truth. The Society's ecclesias are service-director and elderridden, these in turn are pilgrim-ridden, and these finally are Rutherford-ridden. Thus their democracy, autonomy and independence are very much. compromised, and the channel doctrine, with its little pope as head, has largely destroyed ecclesiaism in the Society churches throughout the world.

(46) Among many Truth people, therefore, clericalism is one of the burning questions. It is almost everywhere rampant. In Little Babylon we have a little presbyterial system of church government—the rule of elders. In its work-director we have its ecclesial

bishop. In its auxiliary pilgrims we have the little diocesan bishops. In its boards we meet the little patriarchs. In the heads of the various foreign headquarters we have the little metropolitans. In the Society pilgrims we have the little cardinals, and in the Society's president we have the little pope. Trampled under the feet of these clericalists the democracy that in Bro. Russell's day exercised the autonomy and independence of the ecclesias, varyingly in the four organizational Levite subdivisions, is being destroyed. Some of the brethren have been aroused to appropriate action in this matter; some are very timidly resisting; and some have learned to wear slaves' chains, ground down, oppressed, spoiled of their rights and liberties, and enslaved under a priestcraft more subtle, yet no less real, than that which flourishes in the papal, patriarchal, metropolitan, episcopal and presbyterian sects of Christendom. How long will those who enjoyed the liberty of Christ in our Pastor's days tolerate this ? Yet a few years and it will end forever; for the Epiphany movement in part is a protest against clericalism among the brethren as a form of revolutionism, and it will prevail to the utter overthrow of such clericalism in due time.

(47) And to you, dear Epiphany-enlightened brethren, we would address a suitable exhortation: "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage." Dear fellow-elders, we exhort you to fulfill the admonitions of 1 Pet. 5: 1-3. All others we exhort to love, support, encourage and co-operate with your elders and deacons as long as they act as your servants in and under Christ, but if they should forget that theirs is an office of 'service, and should act as though it were one of lordship, first admonish and resist and finally dismiss them as elders or deacons, if they do not mend their ways. You may, where such conduct is persisted in, in good faith, be sure that they are clericalists, and thus are being manifested as

Levites, whose riddance will bless you, and give them needed experiences for their cleansing. We further exhort all the elders and all the others to brotherly love, longsuffering, forbearance, meekness, mutual care, mutual appreciation, mutual helpfulness in the ecclesias, and loyalty in the study, spread and practice of the Word, always looking for the will of the Head, and obeying it faithfully. Then all will be well with elders and all others. Let us work and pray wholeheartedly to this end.

(48) Hitherto in the study of Num. 7 we have given, type and antitype, our understanding of vs. 1-59, and now we desire to study, type and antitype, the offering of Abidan, the son of Gideoni, the prince of Benjamin, typically set forth in Num. 7: 60-65. In this study we treat of the offering of the prince over the last tribe on the tabernacle's west side—Benjamin (Num. 2: 18, 22) . We have in Chap. I given some thoughts explanatory of the antitypical Benjamites. We are to remember that they are the fanatical sects. By the expression *fanatical* in this connection we mean the quality that grounds belief and action, not only on Scripture, but on extra-Biblical impressions, feelings, dreams, visions, "burdens," etc., with the consequence that it prompts its subjects to do more or less unsound things. *e.g.*, some Quakers have by their impressions been made to feel that the Lord laid upon them the "burden" (a deeply felt responsibility) to go stark naked through the streets of populous cities denouncing woes upon their inhabitants for sin, which unsound thing they, therefore, did. Joseph Smith's susceptibility to the impression that he got the book of Mormon from buried golden plates to which he was directed by a vision, and that he translated the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures into English without knowing these languages, are examples of fanatical qualities leading antitypical Benjamites to perform unsound things. Hence occultism plays more or less a part in prompting them to beliefs and actions.

(49) In considering antitypical Benjamin and Manasseh, let us not forget our explanation of the difference between the antitype of Jacob begetting his sons (Gen. 29: 31—30: 25; 35: 16-18) and the enumeration of the descendants of these sons as tribes antitypically, in Num. 1, 2 and 26, as seen in Chap. I. Accordingly, we see that Jacob is used (however in an adoptative sense as the begetter of Ephraim and Manasseh) to type the begetting of the movements that were perverted into the Lutheran, Congregational and fanatical churches from the standpoint of the tabernacle picture; though from the standpoint of Gen. 29: 31—30: 25, by the begettal of Levi and Benjamin, he typed the beginning of the Lutheran and Great Company movements respectively. While the Congregational movement and Church are in the Jacob picture included in antitypical Judah, the fanatical persons are apparently included in all of the movements and churches as individuals in the Jacob type, but are in the tabernacle picture as a class antitypical Benjamin. Noteworthy also is the fact that the changes in the picture affect only the three on the antitypical West side of the Tabernacle—Justice—the change from antitypical Levi to Ephraim in these two antitypes being necessitated by Levi's being chosen to type the antitypical Priests and Levites. For the other nine tribes the Jacob and tabernacle pictures are identical from the standpoint of the nine typical and antitypical tribes and their begetter. The change in respect to the three on the Justice side of the antitypical Tabernacle is perhaps suggestive of the change from justice to love in God's dealings during the Gospel Age, due to the ransom sacrifice of our Lord satisfying justice.

(50) The prince of Benjamin (v. 60) was Abidan, the son of Gideoni. *Abidan* means *my father* (Abi) *is judge* (Dan); and *Gideoni* means *my mighty warrior*. *Gideon*, as we have already learned means *mighty warrior*; and the suffix *i* means *my*. The meaning of the name *Abidan* fits the crown-lost leaders of the

fanatical sects, because they have stood for justice in an all-sided application of that quality Godward and manward, and thus have insisted on God—their Father—being justly the Judge of all. Certainly the moral courage that they showed in standing for righteousness Godward and manward has caused them to be considered by the fanatical sects as their might warrior—Gideoni, ***my mighty warrior***.

(51) The stewardship truth of this antitypical tribe is this: True religion consists of love to God with all the heart, mind, soul and strength, and to others as to self. In other words, with them religion is a purely personal and individual thing along the lines of justice—duty love as distinct from disinterested love. Their emphasis on the personal and the individual, however, has been so excessive as to make them susceptible to confounding their individual peculiarities and personal idiosyncrasies with the Divine inspiration. This is very plainly manifest, especially in the Quakers—the mother sect of the fanatical sects. It is, of course, proper in the religious life to emphasize the personal and individual element, but to do so to the extreme of losing the consciousness of the need of restraint due to the Fatherhood of God speaking in the Bible and the brotherhood in the Body of Christ is bound to produce fanaticism; whereas the wholesome restraint on the individual and the personal element required by dependence on God's will as revealed in the Scriptures and the circumscription of one's own personal peculiarities in the interests of, and for association with the other Body members, gives us a balanced character, which delivers from the fanaticism produced by a religiousness not so subordinated and co-ordinated. This is the real sore spot in all the fanatical sects; and among the Quakers and others of this antitypical tribe it leads to the exaltation of their personal views, feelings, impressions, visions, dreams, etc., above the written Word, and to a consequent despising of the Scriptures in favor of these subjective states, which

they call "the inner light," "the Christ" or "the Spirit" in their hearts, and contrary to which they will not allow the Bible to be interpreted, alleging that the same Spirit that dictated the Scriptures speaks in their own hearts and does not, they claim, contradict itself. Hence they more or less subordinate the Scriptures to their "inner light," their "Spirit within," their "Christ in the heart," which are often nothing except their own fanatical feelings.

(52) But they did have a goodly portion of a truth as their stewardship truth. Had they defined true religion as hearty duty love and disinterested love to God and others based on, springing from and conforming to the Bible's teachings, they would have given the full Truth on the subject. But the full Truth on this subject, as on all other subjects, is a harvest matter; hence they could not get it before; and the location of this antitypical tribe on the Justice side of the antitypical Tabernacle implies that their definition of true religion was quite good so far as it went, but that it needed supplementing by higher truths than they were able to attain. A partial truth, therefore, is what God gave the brother—George Fox—whom God used to start the movement that the crown-lost leaders of the fanatical sects perverted into these sects. The main crown-lost leaders of the various branches of the fanatical sects were William Penn, Samuel Fisher, Isaac Pennington (Quakers), Edward Irving (Irvingerites), Joseph Smith (Latter Day Saints), Alexander Dowie (Dowieites), Andrew Murray (Holiness), and A. B. Simpson (Christian and Missionary Alliance). In all of these brothers we find the faults and virtues of the fanatical sects. We will pass by the former and say of the latter that they were brothers of uprightness and principle and stood out nobly for a heart's religion in contrast with formalism and legalism, insisting on upright hearts Godward and manward. And their followers as a rule, like them, are good exemplars of piety toward God and brotherly love toward man,

which, as St. Peter's analysis shows (2 Pet. 1: 5-7), are the two elements of justice, duty love to God and man.

(53) This truth when announced by Fox was, indeed, meat in due season; for the conditions in Christendom certainly called for emphasis to be placed on heart's religion in contrast with the evils in the world and dogmatism, formalism, rationalism and legalism in the Church. Before describing the conditions in England where George Fox, who began his preaching in 1647, mainly ministered, we desire to give a brief view of the conditions on the Continent. The Thirty Years' War, forced on by the Catholics in an attempt to destroy Protestantism, broke out in 1618 and turned Germany, Austria and the Flanders into a desolation. So terrible were its results that Germany's population at its end was only one-fourth of what it was in its beginning. Religious hate, ruthless cruelty, broken promises and oaths, open treachery, soulless bargaining, calculating selfishness, gross impiety and merciless oppression marked the Catholic side; and Protestantism, driven to desperation, fought for existence as only those who are facing almost certain extinction can. Next to the World War the Thirty Years' War was perhaps the worst ever waged. And such a war brought in its train the fruits that war always brings forth in proportion to the evil spirit in which it is waged. Everywhere in society the evil effects of a lowered standard of religious, legal and moral life could be seen as a direct outcome of the war. Piety toward God and benevolence toward man gave way to open infidelity, blasphemy and irreligiousness in growing measure, while selfishness increased in its spread of man's unkindness to man. In Spain, Italy and Austria a dead Catholicism reigned alone. In France a more or less irreligious spirit spread rapidly in secularism and growing voluptuousness. In Germany and Scandinavia Lutheran orthodoxy reduced religion to the dogmatism of the head and the formalism of the lips.

In parts of Germany, Switzerland and Holland Calvinism did the same, and on all sides—Catholic and Protestant—apart from certain individuals the lack of real personal heart religion was very manifest.

(54) In England conditions bore the same general character. We recall that Queen Elizabeth established the Church of England on the principle of uniformity of worship, and not of belief, requiring on pain of fines and imprisonment the attendance at the State churches and forbidding assemblies—"conventicles"—of all dissidents. James I (1603-1625) , who had the A. V. made, enforced these conditions; but his autocratic ideas of kingcraft by Divine right brought him into implacable conflict with Parliament; and he aroused much disgust in England by more or less disregarding Parliament and by ruling autocratically through selfish favorites. His son Charles I (1625-1649) showed himself as a yet worse tyrant, even dispensing with Parliament when it refused to sanction his absolutism, bringing on a revolution in England, arousing Scotland and Ireland to invade England in support of his army against that of Parliament, and perishing by beheading as a tyrant, traitor, murderer and enemy of his country. It was scarcely more than a year before this beheading that George Fox (1647) began to preach. The execution of Charles I was shortly followed by the English Commonwealth and Cromwell's Protectorate. Much excitement, strife and sectarianism with consequent misreligion marked this period and the one following, when Charles II (1660-1685), the son of Charles I, sat on the throne of England, and when wickedness in the form of infidelity, deism, atheism, prodigality, profligacy and dishonesty greatly increased, with constant clashes between the king and Parliament.

(55) In religion, matters were at a very bad turn. In the established church a dead formalism set in. In Scotland James I and Charles I in various ways sought to hinder the religious freedom of the Scotch people,

who were almost entirely Presbyterian, and succeeded in foisting on them quasi-bishops. In the Church of England three parties developed: (1) the ritualistic party, which gained ascendancy, especially under Archbishop Laud, who tried to introduce a set of rites and doctrines, with persecution of dissenters, like those of the modern Anglo-Catholics. This so aroused Parliament as to lead Laud to the block; (2) the evangelical party, which, as Puritans, more and more became Presbyterian, Congregational or Baptist in their views and aims; and (3) the broad church party, which paved the way to the spread of skepticism, deism and secularism following. Thus formalism, dogmatism, legalism and rationalism spread throughout the religious atmosphere of England and Scotland a veritable miasma. The result was that all classes of society—the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the poor—lost more and more of the spirit of religion and went off on one or the other aberration of ritualism, dogmatism, legalism or rationalism, with the resultant loss of piety toward God and benevolence toward man. Thus in Britain and on the Continent there was great need of a revival of real religion, such as marked every reformation movement. And this made the truth that God raised up George Fox to preach meat in due season. Man's extremity became again God's opportunity to help and bless with the meat in due season: that the true religious life does not consist in ritualism, dogmatism, legalism and rationalism, but in a heart that loves God supremely and man as self.

(56) As said above, George Fox was the Lord's instrument in announcing this phase of Truth and in inaugurating the movement that stressed piety toward God and brotherly love toward man. He was born in 1624, the year before James I died, and his formative period fell within the tumultuous times of Charles I, about a year and a half before whose execution he began to preach his special message, when 23 years of

age. As a boy he was serious and upright: as a youth he began to hunger for the right way, which he sought first from the Ritualists, then the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists and Baptists, but found no rest of heart and mind from these. Great were his grief and uncertainty. He undertook journeys to persons and places where he thought he could get help; but human helpers he found not. He then sought solitude and a wandering life. Some recommended as a cure marriage; others, enlistment in Parliament's army against that of Charles I, offering him a captaincy in the infantry; an old minister "bade him take tobacco and sing psalms and another bade him to take physic and blood-letting." In 1647, after years of uncertainty, he says: "I heard a voice which said, 'There is One, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition.' And when I heard it, my heart did leap with joy." His final reaching of peace shows a somewhat fanatical bent in the way it was reached—his hearing a voice. In the same year he first began to preach his message in the neighborhood of Dukinfield and Manchester.

(57) Henceforth he went from city to city and town to town, preaching (not without his error on the inner light given to all men, as a supposed proof of which he quoted the restitution passage, John 1: 9) his stewardship truth—true religion is, not a matter of the head, but is an entire heart's love to God with all the mind, soul and strength and an equal love to one's neighbor. He invariably testified against the head religion of his day as it was exemplified in ritualism, dogmatism, legalism and rationalism. He sometimes interrupted the ministers in their discourses in protest against their "head religion" and their "book religion." He preached in market places, in the fields, in the churches, in church yards, on the streets, in private homes, on board ships—everywhere that he could get a hearing. He impressed the lesson of God's goodness to man on his hearers as the reason why they should love Him with all the heart, mind, soul and

strength, testifying against sins contrary to such love, like putting anything in the place of God in one's affections, blasphemy, perjury, unbelief, etc. He likewise impressed the lesson of equal love to fellow man, witnessing against sins against such love, like sins against parents and children, rulers and subjects, teachers and pupils, employers and employees, pastors and the flock, against murder, war, the cruel penal laws of England (which at that time sanctioned the execution of one who was convicted of stealing even a chicken), hatred, envy, implacability, against marital infidelity and the gross licentiousness of his age, against stealing, robbery, cheating in goods, in weights, in measures and in property values, oppression of the poor, paying scant wages and slavery, against lying, perjury (he even went to the extreme of denying the right of courts to require oaths of witnesses, applying Matt. 5: 32-37 to all oaths and not to such as are used in private conversation, as the passage limits the prohibition), slander, evil speaking, evil surmising, etc., Thus he faithfully, amid not a few errors, preached his stewardship truth.

(58) Not only did he do "pilgrim" work in England, but also in Scotland. In 1671 he visited Barbados and Jamaica on a preaching trip. Thence he went to America, preaching all the way from Georgia to Rhode Island, exposed to all the hardships of an unsettled or sparsely settled country, his experiences being much like certain of those of St. Paul described in 2 Cor. 11: 23-28. He spent two years in this trip and accomplished much good. In 1677, with his helpers, Barclay and Penn, he visited Holland, and again in 1684, with five helpers, preaching as he had opportunity. His persecutions for his preaching were of the most trying kinds. He was imprisoned nine times, spending in all several years in jails and dungeons. While there, like St. Paul, he wrote much to spread his doctrine. By the trickery of the judges, more than once he was sentenced to jail. One of their favorite

ways of bringing charges of disloyalty against him and his followers was this: English law required the oath of allegiance from all who dissented from the established church, who were also forbidden to hold meetings in private houses—conventicles; and Quakers, rejecting all oaths as forbidden, on refusing to take the oath of allegiance, though willing to affirm their allegiance, were accused of sedition and sentenced to prison as harboring sedition supposedly proved by their refusing to take the oath of allegiance. Their holding meetings in private buildings—"conventicles"—also brought them under charges as violating the laws of uniformity of worship. This meant imprisonment and at one time as many as 4,000 Quakers were in prison and were kept there indefinitely because of refusing to take the oath and to agree to give up their conventicles. Several thousands of them died from the rigors of their imprisonments; and George Fox was broken in health by his nine imprisonments. So treated by officials, their treatment by the rabble may be better imagined than described. Their doctrine of non-resistance and their honesty made them the more easy victims of the injustices under which they suffered so greatly and submissively. On his release from prison, George Fox preached prison reform, as required by the golden rule, and tolerance to dissenters; and his advocacy had much to do with securing the passage of the act of tolerance for Quakers by Parliament, at the advice of Charles II, whereby at once 1,800 Quakers were freed from prison. The passage of this law secured John Bunyan's release from a twelve years' imprisonment on account of holding conventicles and refusing to promise to refrain therefrom, because, while the writer of Pilgrim's Progress was a Baptist, not a Quaker, some of his friends included his name on the list of Quakers' names drawn up for their release from imprisonment in pursuance of the toleration act.

(59) The later life of Fox was more tranquil. His

looks, truly patriarchal and benevolent, inspired respect. His evident honesty, simplicity and self-sacrifice increased this respect. His consistency, that could not be undermined by threats, imprisonments and offers of release, gradually wore away the great enmity exercised against him. His practical measures to relieve the poor, to mellow the opposers and to spread real duty love among the people, in the long run told in his and his followers' favor; and his last years were attended by considerable honor from multitudes that formerly were extremely hostile. Only one act that indicated the fanaticism that has been widespread among his followers can be charged up against him. This was done immediately after he underwent a rigorous six months' imprisonment. It was the following: Mindful of the fact that four martyrs were burned at the stake at Lichfield he, whose mother was "of the stock of martyrs," on market day went barefoot through the streets of Lichfield crying, "Woe to the bloody city of Lichfield." He spent his last years mainly in London, continuing his preaching until a few days before his death, which occurred Jan. 13, 1691, in his 67th year. He was loved by thousands of disciples and more or less held in esteem by multitudes as a righteous man, interested in God's cause and man's welfare as life's chief aim.

(60) The character of the stewardship truth committed to the Quakers and the other fanatical sects constituting antitypical Benjamin has made all of them a righteousness-loving people, interested in heart-religion and in philanthropies of all kinds. The influence of their example and teachings quickened the religious life of British Protestants out of more or less of ritualism, dogmatism, legalism and rationalism; and thus this reform in a religious way did the religious and social life in Britain great good. But it went further. In Holland it lent aid to men like Arminius and Grotius, and in Germany to men like Arndt, Spener and Franke, who as the despised "Pietists" had a wholesome effect against the evils of ritualism, dogmatism

and legalism there and an upbuilding effect on piety and brotherly love. In Belgium and France it made itself felt in such as Jansenius, Quesnel, Pascal, Arnauld, Fenelon and Madame Guyon, who stayed in part these evils in those countries and revived a heart-religion among many Romanists. Certainly their kindly treatment of the Indians in America made for brotherly love, *e.g.*, Penn in Pennsylvania and Philadelphia [brotherly love], as their dealings religiously with others softened the dogmatism and legalism of Puritanism, etc., even if it was won at the cost of four Quaker martyr deaths on Boston's Commons. Much of the alleviation of the hardness of war and of calamities (Elizabeth Fry, etc.) on the wounded and noncombatants and on calamity-sufferers is due to the Quakers, as much of the cruelties of penal life has also been set aside through their efforts. They were the earliest and most consistent advocates of the abolition of slavery and the saloon traffic, and the continual supporters of hospitals, orphanages and other benevolent institutions.

(61) In all the sects of antitypical Benjamin—Quakers, Latter Day Saints, Irvingerites, Dowieites, Holinessites, Christian Alliancists, etc.—the leaders—antitypical Abidan—have used their stewardship doctrine for correction of sin—their charger (for the opposite of duty love or justice is sin), for refutation of attacks of opposing error—their bowl, and for instruction in righteousness—their spoon. Hence Abidan's charger—correction of misconduct—was a witness against sin in all its forms, with pertinent rebukes and corrections; his bowl was a defense of justice against attacks and his spoon was a setting forth of the claims and qualities of justice as duty love. It will be found that antitypical Abidan cultivated learning less than the crown-lost leaders of any other denomination. Indeed, as a rule, they decried book learning and "book religion," by which latter term they meant religion based on a study of the Bible. In this slighting

estimate of Biblical and non-Biblical study we see one of the faults of antitypical Abidan, and consequently of antitypical Benjamin. But this blemish did not much interfere with their offering their charger, bowl and spoon; for the correction of sin (Abidan's charger), the defense of a heart-religion based on duty love (Abidan's bowl) and instruction in righteousness (Abidan's spoon), do not call for much learning. Hence, with more or less unlearned members—Penn, Pennington and Irving, their best read men, were only moderately educated men—antitypical Abidan could yet offer his charger, bowl and spoon.

(62) Accordingly, we find that he did offer well his charger. His sermons and writings are filled with correction of misconduct. He corrected every idolatrous affection and object which the sinful heart is prone to serve instead of God—self, the world, rank, position, popularity, safety, ease, life, health, anger, wrath, possessions, hypocrisy, stomach, the opposite sex, work, office, husband, wife, parents, children, friends, home, country, society, superiors, pleasure, pomp, etc., etc. These he rebuked and corrected as an injustice against God, which proved that God was not loved supremely. He inveighed against and corrected all irreverent, false and blasphemous uses of God's person, character, word and works. Unbelief and irreligion found corrections of their wickedness at his hands. The formalism of ritualism, whether Episcopalian or Catholic, met rebuke and correction at his hands. The neglect of Christ's sheep and lambs by hireling shepherds met his rebuke and correction. The legalism of Puritanism found him ever ready to correct its externalizing religion. Scholastic doctrinarianism was shown by him to be little better than human philosophy that should be put aside. And none the less did he chastise the rationalistic concessions that the latitudinarians made to infidelity. Agnosticism and deism felt the sting of his rebukes and the appeal of his corrections.

(63) And none the less thorough where his corrections of man's sins against his fellows. The abuses of civil officers met his correction. He spoke out plainly against the bribery of judges, ministers and legislators, against the tyranny of rulers, against the cruelty of judges, constables, sheriffs and prison officials, against the warlike temper of rulers, politicians, officers and soldiers, and against their disregard or neglect of the duties that their positions called upon them to fulfill, and that because these were violations of equal love to the neighbor. He likewise corrected the sins committed against the family relations. Husbands' sins against their wives—failure to love, respect, cherish, provide for and to be faithful to their wives—he denounced and corrected. Wives' sins against their husbands—failure to love, to respect, to obey, to care for and to be faithful to their husbands—he treated in the same way. Parental failure to love, companion, support and train their children for this life and the next, he also rebuked and corrected. He sought to set aside children's disobedience, disrespect, lovelessness and distrustfulness toward parents. He corrected peace-destroying conduct between man and man, between citizens and rulers, between parties and parties, and between nations and nations. All injuries to life, health and limb he corrected. The murderer, the hater, the injurious, the implacable, the unforgiving, the angry, the vindictive and the malicious were, one and all, corrected by him. The adulterer, the fornicator, the white slaver and inciter to unchastity received his rebuke and correction. The robber, the thief, the cheat, the counterfeiter, the usurer, the plunderer, the briber and the devastator, were all rebuked and corrected for doing against brotherly love. The falsifier, the perjurer, the slanderer, the evil-surmiser and the scandalmonger, were corrected unto brotherly love. The covetous, the over-reacher, the hard-bargainer, the ruthless creditor and dishonest debtor, alike, felt his rebukes and corrections, as not acting as they would be acted by. Hence, antitypical Abidan offered his charger, in

correction of sin in general and of sins in particular.

(64) So, too, did he offer his bowl. He defended his stewardship doctrine from attacks. The many errors that he cherished on various subjects laid him open to many attacks which he could not answer, but when he was attacked on his stewardship doctrine, that true religion is the heart going out in supreme love to God and equal love to man, he was invincible. When the ritualist said that without forms and ceremonies the unlearned could not express religious devotion, nor worship God with propriety, he pointed out that the spirit made intercession with unuttered groans and that the true worship was that given in spirit and in truth, as the only thing desired by God in the way of prayer and worship (John 4: 23). When the ritualist required worship to be given in churches, as consecrated places, antitypical Abidan reminded him that the Spirit was not restricted to time and place (John 4: 20, 21). He likewise told the ritualist that a service not understood and appreciated by the participant was no Divine worship (John 4: 22). When the ritualist insisted on clerical regalia, incense, etc., he answered that all the Faithful were God's priesthood and that they needed nothing more than Christ's embroidered robe as their garments and the incense of the graces as their prayers to God. Thus he refuted the ritualist with unanswerable argument.

(65) When the dogmatist came with his philosophizing on religion, he answered that his was a science falsely so called that hid God from view and left the heart cold Godward and manward; that what was needed for the Christian life was a heart full of love to God and man, against which there was not only no law, but no philosophy. The legalist who attacked his heart-religion, as consisting of supreme love for God and equal love for man, was refuted by the statement that one could do all kinds of good works and perform all sorts of external moralities, without the heart being touched with love, hence such works would be unprofitable

(1 Cor. 13: 3) . He was shown that the strictest punctuality in observing precepts often left the heart untouched in its selfishness, worldliness and hardness, while the religion of the heart and of the spirit made the life new indeed. The rationalistic attacks of the latitudinarians fell to the ground by the assertion of the superiority of the spiritual heart to the rationalistic head of the skeptical. The latter left the heart cold to God and man, the former made it a living fire, burning perpetual incense as a sweet-smelling savor to God. Certainly this stewardship doctrine refuted every objection that was urged against it; and it today overthrows the objections of the so-called fundamentalists and modernists. Its principle taken into the heart would care for the chief evils now prevalent in Laodicea, as it can refute all arguments brought against it by modern ritualism, dogmatism, higher criticism, legalism and infidelity.

(66) He also offered his spoon, and it was one full of the antitypical sweet incense; for it contained all of the graces in so far as they flow out of justice and many that flow out of charity. What earnest pleas he made for the love that goes out toward God with all the heart, mind, soul and strength! He taught the grace of putting God first, cost what it may. He magnified the life that trusts God where it cannot trace Him. He held out the hope of a better time coming than this evil day which the Faithful must undergo. He encouraged the persecuted, tried and distressed by this hope. He taught all to submit quietly to injustice, and to exercise forgiveness to enemies and inflictors of evil. The meeting of evil, not by evil, but by good, he commended at all times. He commended peaceableness to individuals, officials and nations, as against war. He preached tolerance of others' religious opinions as against intolerance, and benevolence instead of persecution. He held up kindness to man and beast as against cruelty and oppression. He advocated mercy for the fallen, the imprisoned, the war-wounded, the impoverished and the enslaved, as against inhumanity.

He upheld square dealings, honesty and truthfulness as against over-reaching, defrauding and deceiving the neighbor. He showed the blessedness of self-control and patience in thought, motive, word and act. He preached (and practiced) the exercise of righteousness, even when it led to loss of liberty, and so prevailed as to make the word of a Quaker as good as a bond, as can be seen from the fact that in moving them from one prison to another, they, on their promise to go to the other, were often let go there alone of their own accord, without the need of a guard to convey them. To this day the people of the fanatical sects, so greatly have they been influenced to practice these virtues by antitypical Abidan, are recognized as a God-fearing and man-loving people, who can be depended upon to fulfill the requirements of righteousness Godward and manward. Thus, not only has antitypical Abidan offered his spoon with sweet incense, but has been fruitful in securing the practice of all virtues.

(67) This chapter closes our consideration of the offerings of the Gospel-Age princes on the antitypical West of the Tabernacle. The stewardship doctrines of all three show that the camp to the west of the tabernacle typifies those denominations that stand for the principle of justice as one of God's attributes. For the idea of justice underlies the doctrine of justification by faith—the stewardship doctrine of the Lutheran Church; the doctrine of the ecclesia as, humanly considered, the ruler in her midst as an assembly of brethren, each conceding equal—just—rights to others, the stewardship doctrine of the Congregational Church; and the doctrine that true religion is a heart's love to God supremely and to the neighbor as self—duty love, or justice—the stewardship doctrine of the fanatical sects. Thus we have another confirmation of the correctness of our understanding of the twelve tribes about the tabernacle as typical of the twelve denominations of Christendom about the true Church: with the standard of the east camp typing power; of the south camp, wisdom; and of the west camp, justice.

(1) How many chapters on the present subject have we had? Give a brief description of these. How many princes' offerings yet remain for treatment? In what order are the offerings of the tribal princes to the tabernacle's west described? What were the pertinent tribes? What did their standard type? What symbol did it likely have? What Churches were respectively typed by Ephraim, Manasseh and Benjamin? What are the stewardship doctrines of these three Churches ? How are they related to justice? What does this prove as to the standard of the tribes west of the tabernacle—type and antitype?

(2) In the Gospel-Age picture by what one of Jacob's sons were the Lutheran Church and people typed? Why does this thought not fit the tabernacle setting? Why does the tabernacle setting yield a different type in connection with Joseph and Benjamin than the Jacob picture? Explain the differences of viewpoint in the antitype as applicable to the tribes to the tabernacle's west. Why should we take Ephraim, Manasseh and Benjamin to type the three Churches respectively to the antitypical Tabernacle's West? What results from this setting?

(3) Whose offerings are to be discussed in this installment? Who types them? What do the names of *Elishama* and *Ammihud* mean? How do their meanings suggest the Lutheran crown-lost leaders? Who are the main representatives of these? Who were the main ones responsible for sectarianizing Luther's Reform movement?

(4) What, briefly stated, is the special stewardship doctrine of the Lutheran Church? What is a more ample statement of it? What seven things are implied in this doctrine? What is the source and efficient cause of justification ? Its meritorious cause ? Its instrumental cause? What are some characteristics of this doctrine? What did its nature cause it to do to the papacy?

(5) Of what and in what respects is the papacy a counterfeit? What does such counterfeit make it? By whom was it so made? In what particular pertinent to our subject did he make a counterfeit? How will salvation be obtained in the next Age? With what kinds of acts will the Christ assist? What is the difference between Gospel-Age and Millennial-Age justifications? Of what is papal

justification a counterfeit? What proves it an error? Wherein is the counterfeit in papacy's baptism, its offices, its mass, its purgatory, its penance, its monasticism, the latter's vows, asceticism, its beatification, its canonization, its good works, invocation of saints, especially of Mary and Peter, its indulgences, its confirmation, its Lord's Supper, its ordination, its extreme unction, its matrimony, its tradition as part of the source and rule of faith, its idea of faith, its relic, picture and image worship and its feasts? How are these things related to papal justification? How is papacy's scheme of things related to faith justification? What is the contrast between its and the Bible justification? What strategy is manifest in the Reformation's striking papacy with the truth on justification?

(6) Who mainly acted as antitypical Jacob in the begetting of antitypical Levi? What was his position in the Reformation? What are the chief events of his early life? What university did he enter and pass through? What did he do on his graduation? What else did he do that year? What were his chief activities until he became a Reformer? When and by what did he begin the Reformation? With whom and on what did he debate in 1519? What are the titles of two of his leading reformatory works? What did he do in 1520? What are the main events in his life connected with the Diet of Worms? What did the emperor do? What happened to Luther immediately thereafter? What did he do during the next ten months?

(7) What would have been the character of Luther's work, had he died at the Wartburg? To what reactionary view did he there surrender himself? With what result? What did he do with the Reform movement that he began? Of what is he the hero? What were some of his leading characteristics? How does he rank among the world's twenty greatest men? What have his reactionary and sectarian sprit and errors from 1522 onward raised? To what great truth was he loyal? How does his work on it compare with the work of other Reformers as to their stewardship truths? What did he give to the other Reformers? How does he rank in comparison with them?

(8) What in Luther will help us to appreciate his relation to faith justification? What were two marked characteristics of his, predisposing him to lay hold on justification

by faith as a psychological necessity for him? How did papacy's legalism affect his feeling toward God? How did the papacy propose to satisfy his heart's cravings? What did he first do in harmony with papacy's method of salvation? What papal exercises did he perform to attain justification? What did they fail to give him? Why? What effects did this have on him? How did a brother monk seek to help him? How long did his distress last?

(9) What brought him relief? What Scriptures especially instructed and blessed him? What truths did he thereby see? What did they move him to do? What was the effect on him? What did his experience prove? What position did this doctrine take in his life and teaching? What was the result of the impingement of Tetzel's sale of indulgences against this doctrine, as to Luther? In what work of his is his probably ablest exposition, application and defense of this doctrine found?

(10) As a figurative stump-rooter what has this doctrine done? What does not the average person do with his principles? How did Luther do on this point? When did he attain peace with God through faith justification? How long was it before he began to draw conclusions from this doctrine against papal error? Under what circumstances? What did Luther as a confessor require? How did he act toward his penitents who demanded absolution on the basis of Tetzel's indulgences ? What is the papal theory of indulgence? What was the origin and degeneration of indulgences? For what kind of sins were indulgences sometimes granted? What was Tetzel's experience on this line with a certain nobleman?

(11) Of what are indulgences characteristic and revelatory? How did Tetzel's course affect Luther? What occasioned him to reject the idea of indulgences? Why was this? How was Luther advanced in the Truth in debates with Dr. Eck? How did faith justification lead Luther to reject the mass, purgatory, the meritoriousness of "good works," monasticism, celibacy, the availability of the saints' merits for canceling sin, their invocation and intercession, superstitious reverence for their relics, images and pictures, the exaltation of Mary as queen of heaven and intermediary of believers and God and Christ, "satisfaction of works," papal priesthood and hierarchy, papal sacramentarianism, the papal idea of the Church

and the Romish Church as the Church? Briefly what did it do with the papal system? What does this use of it reveal as to God's methods?

(12) What was the quality of Luther's insight into justification by faith? On what four special features of it did he not see clearly? What should not be done to him for this? Why? How should we do regarding his insight into the doctrine?

(13) What great mistake did Luther make? Under whom did he make it? How did he come to make it? How did he begin this mistake? What did Carlstadt and his followers do? How did they therein act? How did their course affect Luther? What did he do in opposition? How did this affect Frederick the Wise? What was his course? How did Luther thenceforth proceed in Reform matters? How successful was he in winning people from Rome? What did he do to keep his following? Under whose supervision? With whose co-operation? What resulted from this course toward other Reformers and his ruler? What lines did his activities follow? What was their comparative immensity? In this of what antitype was he a part? What were-his parts in three of such activities? How did his slavery affect his character and work? How should we do as to Luther ?

(14) What is a proper estimate of the abilities of the Lutheran theologians? Who were the three greatest of Lutheran crown-lost leaders? How do they compare with the leading crown-lost leaders of other Churches? Briefly describe Chemnitz, Gerhard and Calov, in their writings and activities. How were Chemnitz, Bellarmine and Gerhard active toward one another? Who are some of the other Lutheran crown-lost leaders? What did these do as to the doctrine of justification by faith? Describe Gerhard's treatise on this subject. How did Catholics find it?

(15) What was the charger of these crown-lost leaders? How did it correct misconduct along lines of pride, self-righteousness, self-confidence, self-atonement, selfjustification, self-sufficiency, self-development unto perfection, insults to Christ, God-dishonoring views, arrogance of priestcraft and hierarchism, tempting God by

sin, unbelief, despair, lovelessness, despising others, the spirit of fear and ingratitude, indifference toward others, unkindness, covetousness and love of sin? In doing this, what did they offer?

(16) What kind of foes did antitypical Elishama have to meet? Who were the three ablest of these foes? In what sphere did each of these work? Who was the ablest of them? What were his leading characteristics as a controversialist? What did Sextus VI do with his "Disputations" ? How is his "Disputations" regarded by both Catholic and Protestant scholars? What error did the Lutherans hold as to a purpose of faith justification to their disadvantage against the Roman controversialists? What did antitypical Elishama achieve in his controversies with Rome?

(17) How did antitypical Elishama refute the following arguments of papal controversialists: (1) Justification means to make right and, therefore, is by good works; (2) The works of the law, whose justifying possibilities St. Paul denies, mean those of the ceremonial law, not the moral law; (3) The very nature of good works is to justify; (4) God would not have given a law with the offer of life, unless man could realize its offer; (5) Faith does not have a sufficient content to justify; (6) One's righteousness could not justify another?

(18) How did antitypical Elishama refute the following claims of papal controversialists: (7) God would not allow the Church to err on justification; (8) Good works are the condition of entering heaven; (9) Christ's merit does not satisfy justice and secure forgiveness, but it is the infusion into the heart of charity, which makes just; and (10) The Catholic doctrine on justification is true, coming as it does from God's infallible "channel"? What was the character of antitypical Elishama's refutations?

(19) What finally did he offer? How did he use the doctrine of justification by faith to incite to glorifying God and Christ? To faith, hope, love and obedience? To comfort? To self-control and patience? To consecration? To strength? To peace? To joy? To forgiveness? To parental kindness and longsuffering and evangelistic compassion? To longsuffering and forbearance? To love for sinners? To humility? To liberality? To

righteousness? To courage? In the presence of death? To brotherly love? To hatred for sin? In so doing, how did he use the doctrine of justification by faith?

(20) What place did this doctrine fittingly give the Lutheran Church? Why? How should we feel toward the services of antitypical Elishama?

(21) What is the next set of princely offerings to be considered? Who types its offerers? What do the words, Gamaliel and Pedahzur, mean? How do their meanings apply antitypically? From what type is the Congregational Church omitted? Where does it belong in that type? Why? In what denominations it its special teaching held? In what type is it indicated? By what tribe?

(22) What figure illustrates the Church organizationally? What is the Church from this standpoint? What is illustrated by the human spine? The seven cervicals? The twelve dorsals and their sets of ribs? The five lumbars? The one sacrum and one coccyx? The right arm and hand? The left arm and hand? The right leg and foot? The left leg and foot? The feet apart from the legs ?

(23) Who governs the Church? What classes of servants does He use in the Church? What are their separate functions? Those of the Apostles and that Servant? All others? What is not their function? What cannot a local church do to another local church or to the general Church, or vice versa? How are they related to one another? Who is the Head of a local church? Who under Him is the manager of its affairs? What three things are implied in this? Define the authority of the Twelve and of that Servant on this head, and the privileges and limitations of all others.

(24) Summarize the thoughts of the two preceding paragraphs. How are these things related to the stewardship doctrine of the Congregational Church? Define that doctrine. What three things does it imply? How does an ecclesia stand related to all other Christians and ecclesias? What terms designate this doctrine?

(25) of what is this doctrine capable? Who sanctioned this doctrine? What seven things prove its truth, so far as a congregation's managing its own affairs is concerned? What conclusion should be drawn from these proofs? What other fact is compatible with this conclusion? What

illustrates this compatibility? Why does the Congregational Church stand on the antitypical Tabernacle's West?

(26) Who initiated the movement later perverted into the Congregational Church? What are the salient features of his history and activities up to 1578? From 1578 to 1580?

(27) What did his activities provoke? Why? In how many jails was he confined? What did his persecution occasion? What were his activities and misfortunes in Holland? What things did he do in 1583? What seems to explain his strange course? What was done in England with his followers and books, and that for many years?

(28) Against what errors did he protest in general and in particular? What did he restore? Against what? What were the root, the trunk and the branches of the great apostacy? What was the apostasy's point of departure? What is, and what is not, the Scripturally designated office of an elder? What was the condition of the elders during the Ephesus period? Why? What effect had these things on the power-hungry elders? What did the Apostles, especially St. Paul, do as to the apostacy? What was the result? In whose days did it first work openly? Explain the case. How were the activities of the Jewish Harvest sifters related to this apostacy? Prove this answer.

(29) Prove that the apostolic churches as a rule had more than one elder or bishop. How did these differ? How is this to be regarded? How did the elders regard this difference? How is this to be justified? To what did this usually lead? How is this to be regarded? What would have been a preferable way of doing for the chairmanship of elders' and congregational meetings? How did the brethren early in the Smyrna period begin to speak of this elder or bishop? How does the New Testament use the terms, elder and bishop? Prove it. What name gradually began to be applied exclusively to the leading elder? What did this bring with it? What variations occurred in this misdevelopment? When was this viewpoint general? Why was such an officer considered necessary? Describe the epistles of Ignatius. Of what character is their authenticity? If authentic, what view of bishops and elders would they prove to have been held by Ignatius by 116 A. D.? What was the character of the prevalence of this

error? What view did Cyprian advocate in 251 A. D.? About what time did this view prevail everywhere?

(30) What other error accompanied this one? In Cyprian's time what kind of bishops functioned and what kind did not yet function? What wrong did the bishops do to the elders? What similar wrong did the elders do to the ecclesias? How and by what means did they do this? What distinction did they make between themselves and their brethren? In what did this result? Especially when?

(31) What was the first means of accomplishing this end? What was the second means? What was the third? In what did this result for the clergy, the quasi-clergy and the laity? How did this work in point of time in the different localities? When was it fairly general? In connection with what event?

(32) What was the next misdevelopment? Through what stages did it advance? What was its point of departure? Give an apostolic example of the right use of neighborly congregational help in time of need. Wherein did the misdevelopment differ from this case in principle? How did the bishops feel in relation to this misdevelopment? Why? What did they do? What did this do with the Lord's order as to the independence of each ecclesia? What assemblies did the bishops hold? What did these assemblies do toward the churches? Where do we not find such a union of churches and such synods or councils? When and why were the first synods held? Describe the development of these councils. What two sets of things did they determine for the churches? Where and when was the first ecumenical council held? What doctrines especially did it decree? On what pain were they enforced? What qualities did such a council supposedly have? What was the theory underlying it? What special two things resulted from this phenomenon?

(33) Summarize the apostacy so far studied. What other misdevelopment set in? How was it justified? How did it come about? Describe the bishop's sphere before this misdevelopment set in. Give several illustrations picturing various aspects of the pre-diocesan bishop.

(34) How does the diocesan bishop stand as to the ecclesial bishop? How did the diocesan bishop originate? What was a diocese? What in this connection was a country bishop? How did he become a pastor in a church?

(35) What was the next stage of the apostasy in organization? Who were the metropolitans? When did they originate? When and where did they get their name, metropolitan? What were their powers and the extent of their jurisdiction? Cite an example to the point.

(36) Into how many prefectures did Constantine divide the empire? What one was a little later added to these? What title was given to the metropolitans of these prefectures' capital cities? What positions were three of these considered to hold? What council therefore gave them these titles? How did the Roman bishop act toward this title? Why? What did he take instead? When and where was a fourth patriarchate created? How did its incumbent rank? When was a fifth patriarchate created? What patriarchates were within three years' time destroyed? By whom? What was the jurisdiction and powers of the patriarchs? What metropolitans were exempt from the authority of the patriarchs?

(37) What controversy for equality set in? What 18 reasons led to the pope's emerging from this controversy as the head of all the churches. In what century?

(38) How did the pope's civil power originate, increase and come to a climax? How did it wane and end? How did his religious power wane over many people?

(39) How was retribution for power-grasping wrought on the presbyters, bishops, metropolitans, cardinals, patriarchs and popes? How is the stewardship doctrine of the Congregational Church related to every phase of the organizational apostacy? What must be kept in mind properly to appraise the Browne movement? Why?

(40) When, by whom and by what teaching did the sectarianizing of this movement set in? Who a little later advocated this new view? Who transplanted it to America? Who here were its chief American advocates? What two men restored pure congregationalism in America? What later advocate of it wrought in the 19th century? Who is their type? What congregational principles did they vitiate in making an organized denomination of the Browne movement and in making a written creed?

(41) What did antitypical Gamaliel have to do in offering his charger? How did he offer this charger toward power-grasping and lording elders, bishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, cardinals and popes? How does it correct

clerical pride, unholy ambition, usurpation, tyranny, priestcraft, superstition, self-exaltation, oppression and error? The spoliation, degradation, ignorance, weakness, formalism, worldliness and servility of the people produced by clericalism? Position-seekers and power-graspers in a local ecclesia? Scheming to run the church in its various functions? Unbrotherliness? Covetousness? Contentiousness? Ruthlessness? Vanity? Insubordination? Unelderly and undeaconly conduct? Laziness? Negligence? Indifference? How does it act disciplinarily in offenses, disfellowshipment and restoration? In summary, what did antitypical Gamaliel do by such activity?

(42) What else did antitypical Gamaliel do? In what respects? How did he answer the objection to ecclesiaism on the irresponsibility of an ecclesia? On its need of abler and more efficient helpers, available in clericalism's variations? On its need of the orderliness of these other polities? On the supposed Scripturalness of the aristocracy of Presbyterianism in local and synodal elders? On the Presbyterians' arguments as to Scriptural names and words descriptive of elders and their work?

(43) In what four ways did antitypical Gamaliel refute the Episcopal arguments on apostolic succession as against ecclesiaism? In what five ways did he Scripturally disprove the bishops' claims that as rulers over the presbyters they were rulers over the ecclesias? In what three ways did he refute the claims of metropolitans (archbishops), cardinals and patriarchs? What answers did they give to the pope's pretentions to powers? What did he accomplish by these refutations?

(44) What is meant by his offering his spoon? How did he show that ecclesiaism is conducive to righteousness toward God? Christ? The brethren? The ecclesia's officers? In the ecclesia's officers? To humility? To increase the sense of individual responsibility in the ecclesia's affairs ? To brotherly love and care? To meekness? To longsuffering? To patience? To love and defense of liberty? To sacrifice? To proper relations in the Body? To faith? To love and obedience to law and order? To unworldly methods? To holiness? To witnessing at home and abroad? (What were some of the results of the latter activity?) To the mutual relations of the elders and the ecclesia? What is a summary of antitypical Gamaliel's offering his spoon?

(45) In what other denominations has ecclesiaism found acceptance and wrought blessings? What did it do to that Servant? What did he do with it? Who since his death have militated against it? What organization is the chief offender? How? What special error advanced this misdevelopment ?

(46) Describe the various forms of clericalism as it works among many Truth people. What have they done with ecclesiaism? What counteractive movements are abroad among some Truth people? How have others submitted to clericalism? Of what does this remind us? How long will clericalism reign among Truth people?

(47) What exhortation is appropriate to Epiphany-enlightened brethren? To their elders? To their ecclesias as to faithful elders? As to power-grasping elders? To all alike? What will result from heeding these exhortations ?

(48) How much of Num. 7 has been hitherto studied? What is the subject of this installment on Num. 7? Over what antitypical tribe do the crown-lost leaders now to be studied preside? Where are the antitypical Benjamites discussed? What is the force of the word *fanatical* as applied to antitypical Benjamin? Who furnish special examples of this? Explain various features of these examples. What evil thing attends these manifestations?

(49) What should be kept in mind in studying antitypical Benjamin and Manasseh and Ephraim? Explain the distinction between the Jacob and the tabernacle pictures of these, type and antitype. What notable thing is connected with the three tribes west of the typical and antitypical tabernacle? Why were the changes made? What does this probably signify?

(50) Who was the prince of Benjamin? What do the names *Abidan* and *Gideoni* mean? What does their meaning type?

(51) What is the stewardship truth of the fanatical sects? What is the peculiarity of their view of true religion? To what does this expose them? Among whom is this manifest? What is wrong and right in this view? How is a happy balance in this matter obtained? What is the sore spot in the religiousness of the fanatical sects? What do they call that which is this "sore spot"?

(52) What is a general estimate of their view of their

stewardship truth? What does it need as a supplement? Why could they not furnish it? How is this typed by their tabernacle location? What kind of a truth did God give them? Who are their main crown-lost leaders? To which sect did each belong? What do they exemplify? What is good in them?

(53) What made their truth meat in due season? What were the conditions in Continental Europe in the times of George Fox: in state? church? society?

(54) What were the conditions and the rulers in Scotland and England at that time in the state?

(55) What were the conditions in the church in Scotland and England in the times of George Fox? What were the three parties in the Church of England? What four evils resulted from these parties? In what did these evils result? What religious need was there then throughout Europe? How did God meet this need?

(56) Who was used to bring out the needed truth? When was he born? Over what period did his formative years stretch? What was his character as a boy? As a youth? What did he do to obtain religion? Whom did he consult thereon? What was the result? What did he then do? What was he advised to do to still his heart's hunger? How and when did he find peace? What did he do the same year?

(57) What did George Fox henceforth do? Against what did he testify? To what extreme did he go at church services? Where did he preach? What did he specially stress? Against what sins did he witness?

(58) In what foreign countries did he preach? Like whose were many of his experiences? Who accompanied him on two trips to Holland? In what ways was he persecuted? What did he do while in prison? To what trickery did English judges resort to jail him and his brethren as disloyal? On what other charge were they frequently imprisoned? How many of them were at one time in prison? What happened to several thousand of them there? What conduced to their conviction? For what did Fox agitate after his releasings from prison? What resulted therefrom? What great writer benefited from their good fortune? How so?

(59) What was the character of Fox's later life? What caused this? Of what act of fanaticism was he guilty?

Where were his last years spent? What did he continue to the end of life? When and at what age did he die? How has he come to be regarded?

(60) What has made antitypical Benjamin a righteousness-loving denomination? In what are they especially active? What influence did they exert on the religious and social life of Britain? Of Holland and Germany? Through whom? Of Belgium and France? Through whom? Of America? At what cost? Among whom? What effects did they work as to war, prison life, slavery and the saloon? What very celebrated Quakeress was active in philanthropy, especially in war?

(61) For what did antitypical Abidan use his stewardship doctrine? What is his view as to human learning and even Biblical learning? What did this betray? What did it not prevent? Who were their best read men?

(62) What did he first offer? What does this mean? How wide a sphere did his stewardship doctrine permit him to cover in his corrections? What forms of idolatry did he correct? What did he correct as to sins against God? Ritualism? Pastoral conduct? Legalism? Dogmatism? Rationalism? Agnosticism and Deism?

(63) What did he do as to man's sins against man? In the state? In what particulars? In the family? In what particulars? As to peace? As to sins of violence? Unchastity? Dishonesty? Untruthfulness? Covetousness?

(64) What else did antitypical Abidan offer? What does this mean? What handicapped him therein? On what did he refute well? In what four ways did he refute the attacks of ritualists?

(65) In what four ways did he refute the dogmatist? The legalist? The rationalist? What does he do with the contrary errors of our day?

(66) What else did he offer? What does this mean? What ground did it cover: as to God? Man? Love? Faith? Hope? Courage? Meekness? Forgiveness? Doing good for evil? Peaceableness? Tolerance? Benevolence? Kindness? Mercy? Honesty? Self-control and patience? Right? With what fruits was this accompanied? In what has this resulted?

(67) What does this chapter do? What is the central thought of the camp to the West of the antitypical Tabernacle? How do their stewardship truths prove this? What. does this confirm?

CHAPTER VII.

THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES (CONCLUDED). Num. 7: 66—Num. 8: 4.

THE OFFERINGS OF ANTITYPICAL AHIEZER. OF ANTITYPICAL PAGIEL. OF ANTITYPICAL AHIRA. A SUMMARY OF THE OFFERINGS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE PRINCES. THE GOSPEL-AGE MOSES AND AARON AS TRUTH RECEIVER AND GIVER BEREAN QUESTIONS.

THE tribe of Dan was the first tribe of the three on the north side of the tabernacle. All three of the tribes located there were descendants of Jacob through the maids of Rachel and Leah: two of them—Dan and Naphtali—being descendants of Jacob through Rachel's maid, Bilhah, while Asher was a descendant of Leah's maid, Zilpah. The standard of the camp to the north of the tabernacle had presumably on it a human face, typical of love as the quality pictured forth by the north side of the tabernacle (Rev. 4: 7). The chronological order of the birth of Jacob's sons proves that the tribe of Dan types the Baptist denomination, as we have shown in Chap. I; for as Dan was next in time of birth after Judah, so the movement that was perverted into the Baptist Church was the next to form after Zwingli's movement. The word *Dan* means *judge* and is used to show that the product of better truths (antitypical Bilhah) than those of antitypical Leah and Zilpah was a vindication of antitypical Rachel—the spiritual elective truths (Gen. 30: 6). Thus the Baptists are nearer in spirit and teachings to the Little Flock and Great Company movements than the eight denominations coming front antitypical Leah and Zilpah. Our Pastor frequently, *e.g.*, in the B. S. M. on Baptism, expressed the thought that the Baptist Church was nearer the Truth than any other denomination, even as the type would lead us to expect.

(2) The prince of Dan was Ahiezer, the son of Ammishaddai. *Ahiezer* means *brother* (*ahi*) *of help* (*ezer*) and is used to characterize the brotherly and helpful disposition of the crown-lost leaders of the Baptist Church. The Baptist leaders had very little of the clerical feeling in them. They were regarded, not as a clergy class, but as elder brothers of the others. Hence they were on intimate terms of brotherliness with the non-official members of the Baptist Church. This good relation was also helped along by the fact that the Baptists have had the congregational order of church government as against the presbyterial, episcopal or papal form of church government. Thus they were the helpers of their brethren's faith and not lords over God's heritage (1 Pet. 5: 3). So, too, the name *Ammishaddai* fits them in their relation to the Baptist people. This name means *people* (*ammi*) *of the Almighty* (*shaddai*). From the outstart of the movement that was later perverted into the Baptist Church, the involved brethren spoke of themselves as God's people. Hence the crown-lost leaders of the Baptist Church were helpful brothers to them as God's people in many good deeds.

(3) The main crown-lost leader of the Germans-peaking Baptists (for it was among the Germanic peoples that the pertinent Little Flock movement that was perverted into the Baptist sect originated) was Menno Simonis. And for nearly a century this denomination was almost entirely limited to the Germanic peoples. John Smith, who with his church early in the seventeenth century had to leave England for Holland in order to find religious liberty, started the Baptist denomination among English-speaking peoples, though he did this in Holland. A little later one of the members of his church, Thomas Helwys, returning to England started the General (Arminian) Baptist Church, and toward the middle of the seventeenth century a Brother Spilsbury started the Particular

(Calvinistic) Baptist Church. Roger Williams started the Baptist Church in America. In the eighteenth century the General Baptists in England became almost entirely Unitarian, and Dan Taylor reorganized the few remaining non-Unitarian Baptists into the General Baptist Church. In addition to the above-named crown-lost leaders of the Baptist Church, we might mention Charles H. Spurgeon, the great London preacher and writer, as a prominent crown-lost leader of the Particular (Calvinistic) Baptists.

(4) The stewardship doctrine of the Baptist Church is not, as many suppose, exclusive adult baptism. Nor is it water immersion. While these two doctrines are somewhat related to its stewardship doctrine, and are certainly much emphasized by it, they are not its stewardship doctrine. Its stewardship doctrine is much more central to Christian faith and life than these two doctrines. Its stewardship doctrine is this: The Lord's people consist of those only who have separated themselves from sin, error, self and the world, and who have taken Christ alone as their Savior and Lord. They did not believe that those were Christians who merely repented of sin and believed that Jesus died for them. They insisted on more than these two things as constituting one a member of God's people. Including these two things they added what was in reality consecration. And their first adversaries—the Lutherans and Zwinglians—were so insistent that membership in a state-church and justification by faith alone made one a Christian that the Baptists went to the extreme of denying that by faith alone came justification, which they did because their adversaries mistakenly held justification to imply entitlement to the heavenly salvation. And from that standpoint they were right in their opposition—it does not entitle to heaven, but reckons restitution to its possessor. What the Baptist stewardship doctrine really may be stated like this: The Lord's real people consist of the

justified and the consecrated only. This is undoubtedly a truth. Justification by faith makes one no more than a nominal Christian. It does not entitle one to the heavenly inheritance; and the Baptists are right in denying justification by faith as entitling one to heaven, though they are mistaken in their denying it as a truth. They meant the right thing by their denial of it; but not seeing the two salvations or the two steps of salvation in the Gospel Age, they could not properly teach justification by faith with the implications claimed for it by their opponents, and at the same time hold to their stewardship doctrine. Indeed it yeas not yet due to harmonize these two doctrines. This point, too, was a harvest matter, when it was properly harmonized.

(5) Our Baptist brethren would not say that their stewardship doctrine is consecration alone, nor do we mean to be understood as teaching that they do so hold. Rather they set forth the thought that their central—stewardship—doctrine is conversion. But by conversion they do not mean what is popularly meant by conversion, *i.e.*, the teaching that the Methodist Church has so greatly stressed as conversion—repentance of sin and acceptance of Christ as Savior. The Baptist includes these two things in conversion, but adds more than these, *i.e.*, turning from self and the world and taking Jesus as Lord, which is consecration. Conversion as Biblically taught is even more extensive than the Baptist idea of it. It includes all they assign to it, plus all the parts. of the Christian life implied in conforming one's character to the Lord's. In other words, Biblical conversion implies all of one's acts of turning from sin, error, self and the world, unto God until one has become crystallized in God's image. From this we can see that the Baptist view of conversion, though not complete, is nearer right than that of the Methodist Church. From their view we see that disinterested love, as well as faith,

was involved in their stewardship doctrine; for the two qualities that prompt consecration are a faith that trusts while it cannot trace God and a disinterested love toward God. Therefore the Baptists are properly typed by a tribe to the north of the tabernacle—typical of Love as the fourth Divine attribute. And they are properly the first denomination at the North of the antitypical Tabernacle, because love is central to consecration and consecration is basal to all future development of love. Similarly, the Presbyterians are the first on the East side of the antitypical Tabernacle, because their stewardship doctrine—Christ's death for us and our appropriating it by faith, as symbolized in the Lord's Supper—is, chiefly of the teachings of the tribes to the antitypical East, the power of God for us—"Christ crucified . . . the power of God" (1 Cor. 1: 23, 24). So, too, the doctrine of the office of our Lord as God's special Representative—pre-human, human and post-human—the stewardship doctrine of the Greek Catholic Church, is the chief doctrine of those forming the mystery, as the main expression of God's wisdom, and thus gives the Greek Catholic Church the first place among the denominations to the South of the antitypical Tabernacle. Finally, the doctrine of justification by faith, the stewardship doctrine of the Lutheran Church, being the chief one of those occupying the antitypical West of the Tabernacle to exhibit God's justice, gives the Lutheran Church the first place among the denominations to the West of the antitypical Tabernacle.

(6) A clear recognition of the stewardship doctrine of the Baptists will at once enable us to see why they have so greatly stressed the baptism of adults only, and why they in later years came to stress immersion, as the proper form of water baptism. Self-evidently an infant could not experience conversion in the Baptist sense of that word; for such a course as is implied in their use of the term conversion requires considerable

maturity of head and heart, which an infant does not have. It is, therefore, self-evident that only one who has experienced conversion in their sense of the word could really symbolize it. Hence they taught that only the converted should undergo water baptism, which principle voids infant baptism. Hence from the outstart of the Little Flock movement that was later perverted into the Baptist denomination, infant baptism was denied; yea, it was denied even by some who preceded that movement, "the Zwikau prophets," in 1520, whereas the Little Flock movement that was perverted into the Baptist denomination began in March, 1523. Nor did the brethren in that movement insist on immersion as the proper symbol, but allowed the choice to each individual as to whether he would be sprinkled, effused or immersed. Immersion as the sole symbol was, and that first in England, required from about 1642 onward, after the pertinent Little Flock movement had for over a century been sectarianized. Furthermore, the two great contributions that the Baptist denomination has made to Christendom are an outflow of their stewardship doctrine—religious liberty and foreign missions; for since conversion was a heart matter not produced by external force, it was not to be sought by the use of external force like persecution, but by the preaching of the Word; and since the conversion of others is the great commission, foreign missions and domestic evangelistic work should be prosecuted. Roger Williams brought to America the principle of religious liberty and William Carey, the Baptist cobbler preacher of Moulton, England, started the foreign missionary crusade and himself began in India the foreign missionary work which became associated with the sign that preceded the Lord's return—the preaching of the Gospel by word of mouth and Bible translation in all the world as a witness to all nations (Matt. 24: 14) . Doubtless the fact, too, that the Little Flock movement

under consideration and its denominational perversion were more persecuted than any other Protestant Little Flock movement or Protestant denomination, had something to do with their advocacy of religious liberty, though apart from persecution their principle of conversion made its advocacy a doctrinal as their persecutions made it a practicable necessity.

(7) Before describing the member of antitypical Jacob who initiated the Little Flock movement that crown-lost leaders perverted into the Baptist Church, we should call attention to the fact that in starting each Little Flock movement which was later turned into a sectarian system, while the Lord used one special brother most prominently, He always supplied him with an able assistant, apparently on the principle exemplified in the Gospels in Jesus' sending out His messengers two by two. Thus St. John was assisted by Polycarp, Irenaeus by Tertullian, Luther by Melanchthon, Zwingli by Oecolampadius, Hubmaier by Blaurock, Servetus by Laelius (not Faustus) Socinus, Cranmer by Latimer, Browne by Harrison, Fox by Barclay, John Wesley by Charles Wesley, Stone by Thomas (not Alexander) Campbell, and Miller by Wolf (in Europe). And these assisting brothers were no negligible helpers, by any means. In almost all cases they wrought almost as fruitfully as their more fully used leading brothers.

(8) The Little Flock brother who was used to start the movement that was later perverted into the Baptist Church was Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier. He was born in 1480 near Augsburg, Germany, and died at the stake as a martyr in 1528, at Vienna, Austria. He was a learned man, and while yet a Catholic was considered, next to Dr. Eck, Luther's ablest Catholic opponent as a debater. He was a priest and professor at Ingolstadt, 1512-1516. In the latter year he became chief preacher at the Regensburg Cathedral. In 1521 he became the leading priest at Waldshut, Lower

Austria, where a more liberal atmosphere prevailed than at Regensburg. In March, 1523, he publicly went over to Protestantism and immediately began to announce that only the truly converted—those who separated themselves from sin, error, self and the world, and who accepted Christ alone as their Savior and Head—constituted God's people—the Church. In that same month he visited Zurich and converted Zwingli to his idea with the consequent nullity of infant baptism. But two years later Zwingli, having seen that this would practically empty the state-church in which he was doing his reform work, receded from this position, and later became its most forceful opponent. In October, 1523, Hubmaier attended the second Zurich Conference and supported Zwingli in the debate with the Catholic theologians. At Pentecost, 1524, the city of Waldshut embraced Hubmaier's doctrines, agreeing to defend him and them against the opposition of the Austrian government, which would brook no "heresy." After a few months this opposition forced him to leave the city, but he returned again in October as the acknowledged leader of the religious and political policy of the city.

(9) He deeply sympathized with the wrongs that the German peasants suffered; and he had to do with the preparation of the 12 articles embodying their grievances. These were worthy of a Solon and were presented to the German nobility and public. But he counseled against the violence into which the fanatical Thomas Munzer misled them with such fatal consequences to them in the Peasants' War of 1525, in which over 100,000 of them perished in the first Protestant war for religious and civil liberty. At Easter, 1525, Hubmaier received adult baptism and later administered it to hundreds of others, which made a breach between him and Zwingli over his special doctrine and its consequent antipedobaptism doctrine. His example of receiving adult baptism was

followed by almost the entire citizenry of Waldshut. Soon he and Zwingli entered into a literary controversy in which he wrote several books against the latter, who replied. Waldshut having supported the revolting peasants (yea, beginning this apart from Hubmaier's advice while he was in flight from the city for fear of Austria) against whose excesses Hubmaier protested, it was occupied by the imperial troops in December, 1525, and Hubmaier was again compelled to flee, this time to Zurich, where he was arrested. Here, from fear of being delivered to the Austrians, who wanted to burn him as a heretic, weakened by a serious sickness, and under stress of the rack's torture, he recanted, somewhat after the manner of Cranmer, and, like him, he recanted his recantation, charging that it was extorted by torture from a sick man. His recantation of his recantation greatly angered Zwingli, who, sad to say, was in part responsible for his torture.

(10) In July, 1526, Hubmaier found refuge in Nikolsburg, Moravia, where he gained the protection of the leading noblemen of the vicinity. Here he soon converted to his special teaching the entire population, including the ministers and Von Lichtenstein, the political head of the region. And for awhile Moravia, and particularly Nikolsburg, became a refuge and the center of activity for the sorely persecuted brethren, whom Protestants and Catholics alike persecuted with relentless cruelty—antitypical Leah and her children envious of the prospective child of antitypical Rachel's Bilhah. Here, too, Hubmaier entered into the most active period of his literary work, elaborating from various standpoints and into various directions his stewardship doctrine. His clearness and thoroughness as a thinker, writer and debater, enabled him to present his position on its central doctrine and its main related doctrines in such a way as has left almost nothing, except the arguments on immersion, for

succeeding Baptists to add in favor of their views. He was the most sober and amiable of all of the reformers of the 16th century, though not so heroic as Luther, nor so influential as Luther, Zwingli and Cranmer. Early in July, 1527, he was, with his wife, captured by the Austrian authorities, and, refusing to recant, was, on March 10, 1528, burned at the stake at Vienna as a martyr. His loyal wife, the faithful companion of his many persecutions and exiles, was, three days later, drowned in the Danube and her body was burned to ashes. Thus perished the member of antitypical Jacob who started the movement that crown-lost leaders perverted into the Baptist Church.

(11) The history of the persecution of the adherents of this movement and of the earlier Baptist sectarians is one of the saddest, yet most triumphant, of Protestantism. Unjustly the excesses of the Peasants' Revolt were charged against them. The travesty on religion enacted in the Muenster Millennial fanaticism was laid at their door. The excesses of all radicals were used against them, because their opposition to a state-church and infant baptism marked them as religious radicals, especially as they advocated religious liberty and, consequently, sympathized with political and social liberty. Lutheran, Catholic, Zwinglian and Cranmerian rulers hounded them to the limit. So severe was the persecution in Switzerland under Zwingli's advocacy that in a few years, though for a while almost all Protestant Switzerland sympathized with the movement, there were very few "Anabaptists," *i.e.*, re-Baptists, found in Switzerland, where some of their leaders were killed, others tortured and the rest banished. The law in Zurich exiled any family that would not, within eight days, have an infant baptized. By 1530 in Germany 2,000 of them had been led to martyr deaths. Very few of them recanted. Usually they went joyfully to their death, singing psalms and hymns of praise. By 1531

over 1,000 of them suffered martyrdom in Tyrol and Goertz and 600 in Ennisheim. Later, thousands more were killed in Tyrol. Also Austria proper had its multitudes of these martyrs, and even Moravia added some to the many thousands of these slaughtered brethren. We doubt not but among these were not a few who symbolically under the altar cried out, "How long, O Lord God, holy and true, etc." (Rev. 6: 9-11)! As in the case of the early Church, the blood of the martyrs proved to be the seed of the Church, and persecution made the bulk of these brethren all the firmer in their purpose to be faithful, which in most cases they proved to be.

(12) The Muenster Millennial fanaticism, which was not germane to this movement, but was a grotesque parody on it, by its excesses, lawlessness, wickedness and vindictiveness, made the name "Anabaptist" one of the most shameful of appellations. It gave the blackest kind of an eye to the movement, and almost exterminated it in Germany. God's people, as these dear brethren were wont to call themselves, were so unpopular in Germany after the storming of Muenster in 1535, that they dared not show themselves in public. They were leaderless and in their hour of direst distress some of them found a degree of toleration in Holland, where arose Menno Simonis as a leader, and organized them, first, there and then in Germany, his followers henceforth being called Mennonites. He is the first crown-lost leader who perverted a spontaneous and very wide flung Little Flock movement into the Baptist denomination. His activities as such a leader began in 1537, on his being entreated by many Anabaptists to undertake this leadership. He began to write in defense of their central doctrine and besought the magistracy and people not to confound the quiet God-fearing brethren with the wild Muenster fanatics. Soon the authorities were hounding him, thirsty for his blood. His life

was spent in tireless labors amid scenes of frequent danger, not free from some errors and some foolish practical opinions. He banded the Germanic Anabaptists into a denomination which remains to the present freighted with not a few unhappy peculiarities. The sectarianizing of this movement in England and America, in which latter country the bulk of the world's Baptists are found, has been sufficiently described. These people being greatly persecuted, the persecution being resented by their leaders and the assertion of their right to tolerance are in part typed by Rachel's claim to vindication at Dan's birth.

(13) Let us repeat a former remark—the stewardship doctrine of the Baptist Church is not the exclusive baptism of believers, nor immersion, the latter not being made a denominational test until more than a century after the Little Flock movement under Hubmaier began; but it is this: God's people consist of the converted only. This position is undoubtedly true, understanding conversion in the limited sense of turning from sin, error, self and the world, to Jesus as one's Savior and Lord. Without these steps no one could get the Holy Spirit, whose possession is indispensable to one's becoming a Christian (1 Cor. 12: 12, 13). Later, Baptists, seeing that there was something of a death, burial and resurrection in conversion as they understood it, could see in immersion something of a symbol of these and, therefore, stressed immersion as a sign of it. But not seeing clearly our death with Christ in the Sin-offering and our rising with Him as New Creatures, they could not see the fitness of the real and symbolic baptism, though they approached the Truth on this subject nearer than any other sect. Thus the crown-lost leaders of antitypical Dan were in a good position to offer their charger, bowl and spoon to the Lord.

(14) Accordingly, we find that antitypical Ahiezer did offer his charger, bowl and spoon, and we here

with proceed to the discussion of these acts, beginning with his offering of his charger. Like all chargers, his was correction of misconduct, in this instance from the standpoint of conversion as being separation from sin, error, self and the world, and accepting Jesus as one's Savior and Lord. As shown above, conversion includes further steps, even everything that is implied in turning the character into a crystallized image of God and Christ. But as the fullness of the doctrine of conversion was not entrusted to the Baptist Church as its stewardship doctrine, its charger, bowl and spoon could go no further than to cover the points involved in their stewardship doctrine. Antitypical Ahiezer, therefore, offered as his charger, correction of conduct against conversion as he viewed the subject. This gave him a vast field to survey in his corrective work; for it involved every breach as to sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, as well as every neglect of Jesus' Saviorhood and Headship. His field of correction was even wider than that of the crown-lost leaders of the fanatical sects, since the latter could rightly correct sin only as the violation of justice, duty love. Therefore, all the corrections that antitypical Abidan offered as his charger, antitypical Ahiezer offered as a part of his charger. Having given details on this above, when treating of antitypical Abidan's charger, we will not repeat them here as a part of antitypical Ahiezer's charger, but will limit our discussions to those that are peculiar to the latter's charger-corrections of misconduct.

(15) Therefore he corrected the misconduct which was produced by errors, in so far as he could see them, on the subjects not only connected with his stewardship doctrine, but with some others. Therefore, he frequently denounced and corrected the evils of the clergy, in their power-grasping, lording it over God's heritage, debasing their subjects, exploiting them to their own profit, lack of interest in the spiritual

interests of their dupes, fostering superstition, setting aside God's teachings, practices and organization and introducing contrary ones, seeking not the welfare of the sheep, but their fleece, using force in their favor and against God's servants, uniting church and state, regarding all members of state-churches as Christians, fostering formality, etc. All of these features of priestcraft they rebuked and corrected as flowing out of the error of the Divine right of the clergy. They also rebuked and corrected as flowing out of the error of the Divine right of rulers the course of kingcraft as it expressed itself in absolutism, chicanery, land hunger, extreme taxation, market hunger, protecting the rich and powerful as against the poor and weak, corruption, oppression, militarism, squandering state funds and resources, dishonest diplomacy, breaking solemn treaties, exploiting and despoiling weak nations, exercising might as against right, supporting corrupt favorites, persecuting God's people, supporting false religions, etc. They likewise rebuked and corrected as flowing out of the error of the Divine right of aristocrats the abuses of the officials and aristocrats, such as corruption of judges, legislators and ministers, election frauds, the spoils system, graft, boss rule, land frauds, crooked finance, stock and price gambling, watering, manipulating and frauds, legal technicalities and delays, monopolies, underselling, adulterations, subsidizing selfish propaganda, landlordism, bribery, dishonesty, tax dodging, favoritism, high finance, misusing trust funds, panic manufacturing, luxury, oppression of the laboring and peasant classes, etc. All the above abuses flowed more or less from the errors of the Divine right of the clergy, kings, and aristocrats. It was through suffering from many of the above-mentioned abuses that the fanatical and unconsecrated hangers-on among the early "Anabaptists" were goaded on to desperation and to the consequent taking up of the sword to wreak vengeance on their

oppressors, resulting in the fateful uprising at Muenster in 1535—a solemn warning to all Christians.

(16) In addition to rebuking and correcting the above-mentioned abuses flowing out of the error of the Divine rights' doctrine and of other errors, antitypical Ahiezer rebuked and corrected the various forms of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness that hindered accepting Jesus as one's Savior and Lord. The pride that felt itself too exalted to repent of sin and to bear the cross he exposed and corrected. The love of human approval that shrank from the shame of the cross, or acknowledging one's sins he rebuked and corrected. The love of ease and comfort that shunned the self-denials incidental to the toil and hardship of the Christian worker and soldier he rebuked and corrected. The love of life that sought to save the person from the dangers of sickness, torture or death, frequently called for by Jesus' Lordship he exposed and sought to set aside. The contentiousness that would destroy the peaceableness of the true disciple he rebuked and corrected. The vindictiveness that would exact an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth from their injurers and persecutors he frowned upon and set aside. The hypocrisy that would hide one's allegiance to Christ amid threatening enemies he treated likewise. The covetousness that would keep back possessions when needed for the spread of Christ's cause he also rebuked and corrected. The love of luxury that hindered self-giving in hard service of the Truth he rebuked and corrected. Any putting of the opposite sex, husband or wife, parents or children, brethren or relatives, friends or neighbors, home or native land, calling or station, human learning or attainment, above loyalty to Christ as Lord, he corrected, as well as rebuked. Thus he offered his charger—correction of sins, error-produced conduct, selfishness and worldliness that acted against his stewardship doctrine—for the cleansing of many.

(17) He likewise offered his bowl, refutations of errors held against his stewardship doctrine. These errors were sometimes used to combat his stewardship doctrine and sometimes he used his stewardship doctrine to refute opposing errors. Accordingly, he made a defensive and aggressive use of his stewardship doctrine against error, even as every other one of the twelve stewardship doctrines had to fight its way against opposing errors and defend itself against their attacks. Perforce the claims of the solifidians (the proponents of justification by faith alone) had to be opposed by antitypical Ahiezer, because they claimed that faith-justification made one a member of God's real people and was the passport to heaven. He, therefore, proved from the Word that nobody could be of God's people unless he gave up sin, error, self and the world, and took Christ as his Savior and Lord, all of which things were not done by those who merely repented of sin and believed that Jesus died for them. (Matt. 7: 14; 16: 24-27; Mark 8: 34-38; Luke 14: 26, 27; Acts 14: 22; John 14: 15-17, 21-24; Rom. 12: 1, 2; 1 Thes. 3: 3, 4; 2 Tim. 2: 10-12; Heb. 12: 1-3, 14; 1 Cor. 9: 24-27; Gal. 6: 7-10; Rom. 8: 12-14; etc., etc.) While he taught that repentance and faith were conditional for forgiveness, he contended that this was not enough to make one a member of God's people and insure him heaven. He was herein right and to this extent by the above passages refuted the use of justification by faith as an alleged refutation of his stewardship doctrine, though not seeing the two steps of the Gospel-Age salvation, nor that justification merely reckons restitution so that one may be thereby acceptable for sacrifice, he was quite lame in assigning a proper place to justification by faith alone, even if he was able to refute its use against his stewardship doctrine. In this he was, from another standpoint, handicapped, like the crown-lost leaders of the Lutheran Church, who, as we saw, while able to refute attacks

against their solifidianism as true, were not able to meet arguments that proved that holiness is an indispensable condition for the heavenly inheritance, claiming that faith-justification was sufficient for it, which their adversaries disproved.

(18) To the claim that all members of national churches were Christians, antitypical Ahiezer replied that national churches were quasi-civil institutions and to be born in one of these no more made a person a Christian than being born in a state that was united with a church made a person a Christian. To the claim advanced by Zwingli, that the sprinkling of an infant made it a participant in the Abrahamic Covenant, just as circumcision made an Israelite infant a participant of that Covenant, because baptism has now taken the place of circumcision, he answered that Abraham's descendants by circumcision did indeed become partakers of that Covenant, but one must be a son of antitypical Abraham—God—and be baptized before he can become a partaker in that Covenant during the Gospel Age—a thing that only an adult can become, because only an adult can turn from sin, error, self and the world, unto Christ as his Savior and Lord, and then symbolize this course of conduct by baptism. Powerfully did he use his view of death, burial and resurrection of the Christian in defense of immersion as the proper mode of baptism, against the sprinklers and effusionists, even if he did not understand clearly the real baptism and immersion as its symbol. His insistence that a heart's conversion was the only way to become a Christian he used to refute all physical force as a means to make people accept or renounce certain opinions and religions; and he thereby strongly vindicated religious liberty against religious coercion. To the claim that infant baptism cleansed from original sin and worked faith in Christ in the infant he replied that faith cometh by hearing (understanding and obeying) the Word of God (Rom. 10: 9, 10, 14, 17), a

thing that an infant cannot do, and not by water, which is to be applied only after one has already come to faith (Mark 16: 15, 16). Similarly he applied his stewardship doctrine to the refutation of the entire sacramentarian system of the Greek, Roman and Anglican Catholic, and the Lutheran Churches, implying as it does a magical effect in the sacraments. Thus his stewardship doctrine refuted every opposing doctrine and set aside every magical work in religion and rightly claimed that the personal character and attitude of the head and heart toward sin, error, self, the world and Christ, counted exclusively in real conversion, without which, he victoriously contended, no one could belong to God's people.

(19) Antitypical Ahiezer, finally, offered his spoon—instructions in righteousness, as a logical outflow of his stewardship doctrine. As a logical conclusion his idea of conversion as having two parts: (1) a separation from sin, error, self and the world, and (2) a taking of Christ as Savior and Lord, implied that he would instruct along the lines opposite to sin, error, selfishness and worldliness and unto faith in Christ as Savior and obedience to Him as Lord. From these standpoints we see how it was his province to instruct and exhort as to every virtue and every grace, as well as to every good word and work. And he has done this, as his writings and oral teachings prove. Therefore he held up, as things that should be developed, carried into action and made to overflow: faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love, charity, humility, simplicity, industriousness, self-sacrifice, peaceableness, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, candor, liberality, temperance, self-respect, winsomeness, agreeableness, peace, self-defense, aggressiveness, self-preservation, tactfulness, providence, patriotism, domesticity, the family spirit; friendship, chastity, meekness, obedience, zeal, moderation, magnanimity, gentleness, joy and faithfulness. These, as the opposites

of the effects of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, in their various forms, of necessity he negatively encouraged in his hearers as he urged their turning away from sin, error, self and the world; and he positively inculcated them as he insisted on the acceptance of Jesus as Savior and Lord. His insistence on accepting Jesus as Savior enabled him to bring to faith-justification many people, despite his questionable attitude toward justification by faith alone.

(20) From another standpoint his stewardship doctrine enabled him to offer his spoon—instruction in righteousness. His emphasis on the character element in religion, as necessitated by his view of conversion's relation to membership among God's people, made him offer certain features of his spoon. We refer, among other things, to the spirit of tolerance that he inculcated in his advocacy of religious freedom. Knowing that if one's religious views are not a matter of his personal conviction, his religiousness is worthless before God and an evil influence to himself and others, he was by his views kept back from intolerance. Not only so, but this view of things made him winsome, tactful and persuasive, because he sought to win unto conversion. Consequently he inculcated these qualities in others as he prepared them for evangelistic work. Thus his stewardship doctrine made him inculcate the art of soul-winning and aroused to the evangelistic spirit. This likewise led him to encourage others to spread Bibles and other conversionist literature. His position, for example, naturally caused John Bunyan, one of the most famous of all Baptists, to make his book, Pilgrim's Progress, which, next to the Bible, has had the widest circulation of any book, the greatest piece of conversionist literature, in the Baptist sense of conversion, in all Christendom. It has converted, in the Baptist sense of that word, millions in its ministry of about 250 years. Similar remarks are applicable to antitypical Ahiezer's exhortations to love for souls and

self-denial in their interest that have made the Baptist Church the pioneer in the modern foreign missionary crusade. Thus in these respects the central position of the doctrine of conversion in the Baptist system of thought has been very fruitful as an instruction in righteousness. Surely in antitypical Ahiezer's spoon there has been much sweet incense—an offering acceptable to the Lord.

(21) The above study is another evidence that we have properly understood the Gospel-Age camp and the twelve denominations of Christendom to be the Gospel-Age antitype of Israel's twelve tribes. This study has also given us further evidence that we have understood the Gospel-Age antitypes of Leah, Rachel, Bilhah and Zilpah. The persecutions that the Baptists and Unitaro-Universalists have suffered from the pertinent eight other denominations of Christendom—the descendants of antitypical Leah and Zilpah—certainly corroborate our thought as to the relation of Bilhah to Rachel—type and antitype—in the family of typical and antitypical Jacob. The more the details are brought forth, the more we can see that the Lord has favored us with the light on the book of Numbers. Let us in thought, motive, word and act reflect credit upon Him for this expression of His love and favor toward us; for He certainly richly deserves it!

(22) Asher was the second son of Zilpah, Leah's maid, Gad being her first son. The name *Asher* means *happy*, in the sense of *joyous* and *fortunate*. In the type Leah, as the mother of six sons (for her maid's sons were legally hers), could naturally consider herself happy and fortunate, and therefore naturally gave the sixth son the name *Asher* (Gen. 30: 12, 13). Antitypical Asher, as we have already seen, is the Methodist Church, and the servants of the stewardship truth of that Church, just because of the character and effects of that truth, were joyous and fortunate, and very much stressed their joy and good fortune. Perhaps the

leaders of no other denomination have stressed joy as a state of mind and as an evidence of God's blessing and favor more than they. Indeed, they have stressed these two things to such a degree as to question the Christian standing of those who did not feel the exuberance and prosperity that they have felt. "Shouting Methodists" came to be no uncommon appellation for people of this denomination. Thus we see that this typical tribe came to the name *Asher* with propriety, and that the antitypical tribe came into the possession of happiness in both senses of the word in propriety with its stewardship doctrine.

(23) Unlike the children of antitypical Bilhah, who were greatly abhorred and persecuted by the children of antitypical Leah and Zilpah, antitypical Asher was held at arm's length by the children of antitypical Leah and the other child of antitypical Zilpah only to that degree necessary to show that he was another antitypical tribe than they. Therefore we do not hear of any of these using gross forms of persecution against the servant of the Truth that begat the pertinent Little Flock movement nor against his colaborers nor against the crown-lost leaders nor against their followers. It is true that the more or less non-church-going rabble sometimes mistreated the Methodists, especially charging them with a "holier than thou" spirit, and in various ways showing their contempt even unto riotous demonstrations against them; yet the denominations as such did not engage in gross persecution, and none mistreated them as the Congregationalists, Quakers, Baptists and Unitarians were treated by the other denominations. One illustration that shows the contempt of the more or less non-church-going rabble and the protection of the civil officials will suffice to clarify this point: In a certain place in England the rabble seized on about 20 Methodists and, putting them into a wagon, drove them to the justice. Their accusers, being asked by him to prefer their charge against them, were unable

to express one for a long time. Finally one of the rabble cried out: "Why, they pretend to be better than other people; and, besides, they pray from morning to night." The magistrate asked if they had done nothing else. "Yes, sir," said an old man, "they have *converted* my wife, an't please your worship. Till she went among them, she had such a tongue! And now she is as quiet as a lamb." "Carry them back, carry them back," said the magistrate, "and let them convert all the old scolds in town! "

(24) The prince who offered for Asher was Pagiel, the son of Ocran. The name *Pagiel* means *interventions of God.* This significance found its antitype in the fact that God's providences were very marked in the experiences and works of the crown-lost leaders of antitypical Asher, as well as in those of this antitypical tribe itself. Many are the anecdotes related of these leaders illustrating their marked deliverances from danger, the supply of their needs, their manipulation into scenes and environments where they did much good or forestalled evil that otherwise would have wrought much havoc. The world would call them lucky; but the pious Methodists knew how to ascribe these interventions to the Lord's special care, and counted themselves fortunate therein, and were accordingly happy. Indeed, they went to extremes in these matters, often thinking that God intervened for them in the casting of lots and in making their eyes fall on the Scripture that solved their perplexity in a chance opening of the Bible to an appropriate passage while searching for the Lord's intervention in this way. They learned to use these methods from the brother who started the Little Flock movement that was later perverted into the Methodist Church; for he resorted at times to such things in seeking to find out the Lord's will. The name *Ocran* means *troublesome*, and seems to apply to the crown-lost leaders under consideration, because their spontaneous religiousness, insisted upon

as against the indifference of a skeptical, sophistical and artificial age like the 18th and the early part of the 19th centuries, made trouble for the formalistic professors of the then current Churchianity.

(25) The Methodist Church is one filled with the spirit of propaganda, which has resulted in its far-flung and numerous members and adherents. There are perhaps now 20,000,000 Methodist members and adherents in the world. This implies a very large membership in its prince. The founder of the Little Flock movement that was perverted into the Methodist Church remaining on earth over 50 years after he began his movement, crown-lost leaders did not get a chance to sectarianize this movement until very late in his life—at the time that they finally succeeded in getting him to make (1784) a deed of declaration which gave the annual conferences that he had been holding with his preachers since 1744 a legal constitution, and which gave, after his death, to a board of 100 ministers the controllership over the work that he supervised from 1738 until his death in 1791. This, of course, sectarianized the noble Little Flock movement begun by John Wesley. The following are the leading members of antitypical Pagiel: Dr. Coke, whom, first of all, John Wesley ordained, and that as a superintendent (bishop) for the American field; Francis Asbury, "the John Wesley of America," whom John Wesley charged Dr. Coke to ordain as his fellow-bishop in America; Adam Clarke, the Commentator; Richard Watson, D. D. Whedon, Bishops Simpson and Hurst. Before 1784 the Wesleyan movement was an independent movement almost exclusively within the Church of England; but with the deed of declaration separation was a foregone conclusion; and from that time on, though Wesley, after the same manner as our Pastor, continued to control the general work, the sectarianizing of the Methodist movement gathered momentum; and immediately after Wesley's death Methodism was

recognized as separate and distinct from the Church of England. Thus, through his control of the movement until his death, the complete sectarianizing of the movement was delayed longer than that of any other Protestant Little Flock movement. Wesley's concessions to the sectarianizers was his part in antitypical Samson's blindness and captivity.

(26) Because of the strong emphasis that Methodists place on several doctrines, its peculiar stewardship doctrine, in a manner similar to that which we pointed out among the Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Baptists, has not been recognized by the usual student of the Methodist body. Some will say that what they style conversion—contrition for sin and assurance of forgiveness, culminating in a triumphant victory over sorrow for sin through faith in Christ's death, amid much emotion—is the central or stewardship doctrine of Methodism. Others would say that the great stress that they place on peace and joy in a consciousness of sins forgiven proves that the feeling of peace and joy for sins forgiven is their stewardship doctrine. While these things are stressed by Methodists, as they also were by John Wesley, and that because somewhat related to their stewardship doctrine, they are, neither of them, their stewardship truth. This will at once be recognized, if we keep in mind that the place of the Methodists is at the North of the antitypical Tabernacle—love. Hence their stewardship doctrine must in some way be connected with love. From this point of view, as we look at John Wesley's teachings, we find very little difficulty in locating the stewardship doctrine of the Methodist Church. While he stressed "conversion" as he understood it, and also the feeling of peace and joy in the consciousness of sins forgiven through faith in Christ's death, this was from his standpoint merely a means to an end.

(27) And what was that end? The answer to this question brings us face to face with what is his stewardship

doctrine—the Divine love as the heart of sanctification is the Divine ideal for the Lord's people. The reason why he emphasized "conversion" and the feeling of peace and joy in the consciousness of sins forgiven, is that they, in his view, constituted "the first blessing" that had to be experienced preparatory for the advance toward "the second blessing," as the introduction to a life of sanctification in the Divine love as the ideal of the Christian life. Hence the great stress that Wesley laid on such a sanctification as has perfect love as its heart. He usually called this, "Christian perfection," which expression his theological enemies perverted into meaning absolute perfection in the flesh. This was not his thought, though Wesley did not always guard his explanations sufficiently to refute the charge that he taught that some Christians, *i.e.*, those who experienced this second blessing, came into a sinless condition. His most extended presentation of his teachings on this subject is in a 24 mo. book of 175 pages, entitled, A Plain Account Of Christian Perfection. Repeatedly he states in this book that by Christian perfection he does not mean faultlessness, nor absence of weaknesses and mistakes, but such disinterested love to God and man as conquers sin, self and the world. For this love he claims that it takes away sinful, selfish and worldly inclinations and makes the heart pure and full of goodness. As we have seen in all other cases (except St. John) of the members of antitypical Jacob who started Little Flock movements, later perverted into sectarian systems by crown-lost leaders, Wesley failed to see clearly the full light on his stewardship truth. And, as was the case with them, so this was due in his case to the full Truth not yet in his time being due on the subject in its various relations, the due time for this being reserved by the Lord for the Harvest. But his central thought that the Divine love as the heart of sanctification is the Lord's ideal for His people, was undoubtedly true.

(28) Keeping in mind what was his stewardship truth, and realizing that his heart was filled with such a love, we are prepared to see why he devoted so much of his time to evangelistic work; for he is undoubtedly the greatest evangelist that ever lived. Seeing so many Church members about him who, while they should have been enjoying "the second blessing," were not even enjoying "the first blessing"—justification by faith—his love for them, combined with the error that they were liable to eternal torment, prompted him of necessity to seek to bring them to justification. Therefore he and his associates so greatly stressed repentance in the sense of contrition, and faith in the sense of the assurance of sins forgiven through Christ's death. Hence, also, after the consciousness of remorse for sin had crushed the heart and faith in the death of Christ had received forgiveness for sin, he and his associates insisted on a contrasted feeling of peace and joy possessing the heart freed from the sense of remorse by the assurance of forgiveness. However, these brethren stressed such teachings in order that these teachings, bringing people through the first blessing, might furnish them candidates for them to lead onward to "the second blessing." Thus we see that these two doctrines—repentance and faith, peace and joy in forgiveness—while not being their stewardship doctrine, were so related to it as to force the brethren to preach them, as well as their stewardship doctrine, to make the latter workable.

(29) This doctrine with its two preparatory doctrines were due at that time. The 18th century was a period of religious decline. In international relations there were much friction, envy, land grabbing, wars of conquest and oppression, culminating in the War of Independence between the American Colonies and Britain and in the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars in Europe. The aristocracy of Britain had become especially power, money and pleasure lovers. The clergy

of the Church of England were as a rule aristocratic in feeling, worldly in their ambitions and clericalistic in their religion, to whose hearts the religious welfare of the common people meant but little. The religiousness of the middle class was as a rule purely formal, as can be seen, *e.g.*, in the decision of a magistrate who felt that, having in his town Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Quakers, there were enough ways to get to heaven to suit any reasonable man, and that if any one in his town was not satisfied to go to heaven by one of these, he would not allow him to go there by any other, and therefore forbade the Methodists to live or propagate their faith there! The unutterable poverty, in religious respects, of England's lower class was extreme. The basest and most bestial conduct, surroundings and mental outlook were theirs. And the deplorable religious, condition of all these classes, as sheep scattered and fainting without real shepherds, touched the hearts of Wesley and his colaborers to do, to dare, to sacrifice and to suffer for these lost souls. Having such sad conditions facing them on all sides, and having hearts filled with Divine love, and fearing eternal torture for the unbelieving, is it any wonder that their stewardship doctrine, as a living power in their hearts, made revivalists of them, that they might lead their converts to the saintliness of Divine love in sanctification, as their privilege as God's people? Accordingly, we see that their stewardship doctrine in itself was meat in due season, and led them to help others through "conversion" to come into a condition in which it would be meat in due season for them.

(30) We now desire to give some general thoughts on John Wesley, whom Divine providence raised up to be the part of antitypical Jacob used in the begettal of antitypical Asher. He was born in 1703 at Epworth, England, and died in his 88th year in 1791 at London. His father was a Church of England clergyman and a

noted writer on Biblical subjects, and his mother was an especially able helpmeet to her husband. The children of this couple are a splendid illustration of how good parents may raise good children. John and Charles were the most gifted and saintly of these children, the former becoming one of the foremost members of the Philadelphia star, and the latter the greatest hymn writer of all ages, giving the Church upward of 6,000 hymns, some like, Jesus Lover of My Soul, being among the finest ever composed. But as great as Charles was, John was even greater, though the former's inferior as a poet. At six, John barely escaped cremation in the burning of his father's home, set on fire by "some of those of the baser sort" who resented his father's preaching. He was educated until twelve by his gifted, wise and saintly mother, then was taught for six years at Charterhouse, London, whence in 1720 he entered Oxford University. In 1725 he was ordained a deacon, and in 1726 was elected a fellow of Lincoln College at Oxford and ordained a presbyter. In Oct., 1726, he became Greek lecturer and moderator of the classes at Oxford, acquired the title of M.A. in 1727, and then for two years became his father's assistant in the Epworth parish. In 1729, returning to Oxford, he became the leader of "The Holy Club," a company of pious students who devoted themselves, apart from their regular studies, to the Greek New Testament, fasted Wednesdays and Fridays, communed every Sunday and visited the sick, the poor and the imprisoned. The members of this club, because of their methodical religious practices, were nicknamed "Methodists," and because most of them later became sympathetic with Wesley's great religious movement, the name "Methodist" went over to the movement and the people of that movement as a nickname. From 1729 to 1735 Wesley taught at Oxford University; then he, accompanied by Charles as Gov. Oglethorpe's secretary, went to Georgia as a missionary to the Indians

and pastor of the colonists, remaining until 1738 with but poor success, ending in his flight to England.

(31) On May 24, 1738, in a London meeting, occurred what he called his "conversion." After telling that it occurred at a service where Luther's introduction to the Epistle to the Romans was read, he describes it as follows: "About a quarter before nine [P. M.] while he [Luther in this introduction] was describing the changes which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strongly warmed, I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death." Mr. Lecky points out the significance of this event as follows: "It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the scene which took place at that humble meeting in Aldersgate St. forms an epoch in English history. The conviction which then flashed upon one of the most powerful and most active intellects in England is the true source of English Methodism." (History of England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. 2, 588.) It was through the Moravian Brethren that this change occurred in Wesley. We think that Wesley was mistaken in using the word "conversion" in his sense of that word to describe this experience; for he had for years been, not only a justified, but also a consecrated man. The true explanation of this experience is that it was the quickening of his New Creature, which gave him a deeper and more vivid conviction than he had ever had before of his justification and of his new-creatureship, which in an unquickened manner he had for years had. But, call it what one might, from that time forward Wesley entered a new activity wherein he for nearly 53 years remained until a few days before his death—Mar. 2, 1791.

(32) At first he preached justification and sanctification in perfect love in churches of the Church of England as an ordained presbyter of that Church; but

his pointed preaching offended the worldly clergy and soon most of the churches were closed to him. On April 2, 1739, he began preaching in fields and other open-air places, the churches becoming closed to him and his congregations becoming too large for any church building. He not infrequently, even in his eighties, addressed audiences of 30,000, and was at that age heard by listeners with perfect ease 140 yards from him, so clear and penetrating was his voice. One of his historic open-air series of services was conducted at Epworth, June, 1742. Being refused the use of his father's and his own former pulpit by the then time-serving rector, he stood on his father's grave and, filled with the solemnities of the sacred associations of his surroundings, preached with superhuman power to several thousands who gathered to hear him. The effect was electrical; hundreds were converted; and the one service was increased to several. As a preacher Wesley did not attempt the tricks of oratory. His language was simple; his style was argumentative; his manner and speech were direct and quiet, almost conversational; his appearance was not awesome, he being under average size, though his face was distinguished looking and his eye attention-arresting. But there was a power in his voice, thoughts and words that was generated by the dynamo of his wonderful character that made him one of the most persuasive preachers that ever lived. He preached about 900 times a year for about 53 years, traveled about 5,000 miles a year, until in his seventies on horseback, reading and studying as he rode, and from then on until in his 88th year by horse and carriage. Often he would arrive in a town, go to the market place, begin to sing a hymn, which attracted the people to him, offer a prayer and then preach to the assembled crowd. Earlier in his crusade he met much opposition from the rabble, which was usually stirred up by some fanatical cleric. Sometimes he was struck, frequently pelted with stones, mud, ancient

eggs and vegetables, and filth. But he never flinched, he always faced the crowd and usually so overawed them by his strong character, fearless manner and kind words as to disarm their opposition.

(33) Many are the stories told of his encounters with mobs bent on mischief, and of his successful handling of them. The house where he was at Warsal was beset by a crowd which cried out: "Bring out the minister; we will have the minister! " He asked one of his fiiends to invite the captain of the mob to come into the house. The captain with several companions entered and was either so soothed or awed by Wesley's words and manner that he seemingly changed into an entirely different person; moreover, two or three of this man's companions were so won by Wesley's kind words and gentle manner as to experience the same change of feeling. Thereupon Wesley went out to the mob, stood on a chair and addressed them. His words changed the attitude of the mob. Changing their cries, the mob began to call out: "The gentleman is an honest gentleman; and they that seek his blood must spill ours first! " At another time, at Walsal, he had been seized and bruised by a mob. He appealed to them to give him a hearing, and finally gaining silence for a brief space, he began to pray in that clear and moving voice of his. A former prize fighter was the mob's leader; and so greatly was he moved that he turned to Wesley saying: "Sir, I will spend my life for you! Follow me and not one here shall touch a hair of your head." At Plymouth, amid his sermon, the rabble became grossly violent. He left the platform, walked to the midst of the most violent, went up to their leader and courteously took his hand in greeting. The leader immediately said: "Sir, I will see you safe home. No man shall touch you. Gentlemen, stand back. I will knock down the first man that touches him." "And so," says Wesley, "he walked to my lodgings; and we parted in much love."

(34) At Penfield the rabble sought to force a bull through his audience up to the platform. At White-chapel they drove cows among the congregation. At other places they blew horns, rang church bells, sent the town crier to howl in front of him, hired fiddlers. and ballad singers to drown his voice. Sometimes people in his audiences defended him against attacks, *e.g.*, in Bawden, Ireland, a clergyman, a little drunk, made for him with a big stick; but two or three resolute women by main strength pulled him through the house into the garden, where he attempted to make love with one of them, who gave him such a ringing cuff that it sent him sprawling to the ground. Another assailant came on in great fury, but the town butcher, not a Methodist, knocked him down as he would an ox. "This," says Wesley, "cooled his courage, and so I quietly finished my discourse." These experiences were accompaniments of many of his services from 1740 to 1745. These are only few examples among very many of Wesley's earlier experiences. But in later years, especially in old age, conditions greatly changed. The utmost respect was increasingly accorded him; and his comings became the occasions of holidays for entire towns. At the time of his death he was perhaps the most influential, respected and loved man in England, Scotland and Ireland.

(35) One might think that Wesley's traveling and preaching were more than enough for one man; but they were only a part of his work. He spent much time in pastoral visiting while riding his circuits. He wrote many thousands of helpful and thoughtful letters that are even yet edifying. Moreover, he did much work as an author. Twenty years before his death his works were collected and published in thirty volumes. And many more were added afterwards. His Journal, his Notes on the New Testament and his four volumes. of sermons, are his best known literary productions. He wrote not only on religion; but he also produced

good text books, used in schools, and a book on medicine that was in his days in the forefront of works on the healing art for home use, going through some thirty editions during his lifetime. He also edited several magazines, the ablest being the Arminian Magazine, for which he wrote much. Moreover, he published what he called, The Christian Family Library, which included several hundred of the best books of religion, morals, literature, history and philosophy, compiled from the pen products of the world's best pertinent writers. This proved a very fruitful piece of work and actually educated his followers as the followers of few other religious leaders have been. He founded and fostered special schools and colleges. He raised money for and supervised the building of hundreds of chapels. He directed the work and appointments of his preachers. He had the care of all the churches. He organized and conducted the annual conferences of his preachers, and gave much time to advising people who sought his counsel in their difficulties. He founded and fostered orphanages and homes for the aged. His charities were manifold. He would not spend on himself more than £50 a year, and the rest he gave to the poor and needy, as he gave to them the profits of his publications, giving away of his own means in the course of his life about £100,000 (about $500,000.00). To do the above-mentioned mass of work he seldom retired before 10 P. M., and arose at 4 A. M. daily. When he died there were 100,000 Methodist members and perhaps 400,000 others who were counted adherents. Perhaps his genius shone the brightest as an organizer; and the results he attained, while coming from a combination of his activities, were under God mainly due to his ability as an organizer. As a genius he has been favorably compared with Napoleon, who was about to begin his career as Wesley ended his.

(36) The brethren associated with Wesley were colaborers and co-sufferers with him the early years of

his movement. Whitefield, the peerless orator, and Charles Wesley, the peerless poet, had their persecutions to meet as they toiled side by side with him. Another of Wesley's finest associates was the saintly Fletcher, the rector at Madeley, whose able and mild pen defended the principles of Wesley even better than Wesley himself was able to do. His preachers labored and suffered in the same self-denying love of the truly sanctified; and there were gathered about him multitudes who, like him, gloried in the cross and its saving work and self-denying services. Their view of sanctification as centering in disinterested love made them godlike in character and burning and shining lights amid a crooked and perverse generation. The effect of this great demonstration of the Lord's Spirit was deep and widespread. This movement quickened the religious life of England as no other movement before or afterward. Their emphasis on the Divine love made it the natural thing that they would espouse Arminianism—God's love for all for salvation, Christ's death for all for salvation and the Spirit's work for all for salvation—as against Calvinism. This stress produced a split among Methodists, resulting in a small minority becoming Calvinistic Wesleyans. But the glowing love of the many gave them greater access to the multitudes than that of their Calvinistic brethren. King George III, who very much appreciated Wesley, remarked to a nephew of his, Charles Wesley, Jr., that John and Charles Wesley, Whitefield and Fletcher did more good for religion in England than the entire clergy of the established Church. This was quite an impressive testimony for "the head" of the Church of England to give to the movement that most of his clergy held in disdain and wished anathema.

(37) Wesley lived to within four months of being 88 years of age. Very few persons ever accomplished more than he did. His health remained good almost to the end, and only in the last few years of his life did

his eyes begin to weaken. His marriage was a most unhappy one, due to the ugly disposition of his wife. He said his married experiences enabled him to sympathize with job and Socrates! It seems almost impossible to believe, yet it is true that on one occasion his wife dragged him, unresisting, about the house by his hair until she had pulled one of his locks out, when Charles Wesley, entering the house, saw the happenings, which put an end to her disgraceful act. She took some of his letters and interpolated flagrantly some of her own inventions to his disparagement, and sold them to a newspaper which published these interpolated letters as his. After a number of years she deserted him; but her children, his step-children, took his side against their own mother, blaming her as a shrew. Wesley shed no tears over her death, of which he received no word until after her burial; for he received the news without any visible emotion and went, unconcerned, right on with his work. Before their marriage she promised him that she would put no hindrance in the way of his itinerant work; then after tiring of accompanying him therein, and failing in a prolonged effort to make him give it up, she turned into the most spiteful and oppositional enemy imaginable. His experiences in this particular were much like our Pastor's.

(38) If he was hated by the shrew whom he took as his wife, he was all the more generously loved by the brethren. As he approached and was in old age, he was, indeed, a venerable person. His unchilled cheerfulness, unfailing courtesy, self-denying service and holy life, gave him a most noble, distinguished and benevolent countenance, especially an unforgettable eye. On one occasion, in his 87th year, when so weak as to be unable to stand, he yet insisted on preaching, which he did, while two of the circuit riders supported him, one on each side, holding him up under the arms, and thus this brave warrior of God preached his sermon. The effect of this was most impressive and edifying

to the audience. Children loved him and thronged him for his caresses, smiles, encouragements and blessing. He continued to preach until but a week before his death. His last sermon was delivered Feb. 23rd. He wrote his last letter the next day, to Wilberforce, the great anti-slavery advocate, encouraging him in his work, a work that Wesley was one of the first to begin. His death-bed scene is one of the most marvelous in history. All night this dying man led eleven devoted watchers, who were with him to the end, in an informal prayer, praise and testimony meeting, which perhaps never had, nor ever will have an equal, and which ended at his last breath. Very often he repeated the words, "The best of all is, God is with us." Repeatedly he led them in a brief prayer and joined them in their prayers. Repeatedly he cried out, "Praise God," and then they joined in a hymn of praise. Repeatedly, as death was gaining ground, he called out: "I'll praise; I'll praise," unable to say more. Repeatedly he called out: "Pray and praise," and the little company, sinking on its knees complied. At 10 A. M., March 2nd, he cried out, as his last word, "Farewell," and gathered up his feet in the presence of his brethren and died, without a groan or a sigh. Joseph Bradford, the devoted traveling companion and helper of his latest years, and the mouthpiece of the other ten watchers, just as Wesley died, said: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and this heir of glory shall come in." Thus passed away from this earth one of the very best and greatest of God's servants and sons, full of years and good works.

(39) On the basis of such a glorious stewardship doctrine as sanctification centering in disinterested love, the Divine ideal for God's people, we should expect the crown-lost leaders of antitypical Asher—the Methodist Church—to offer a splendid antitypical charger, bowl and spoon; and therein we are not disappointed. Their charger, therefore, consists of corrections

of anything contrary to entire sanctification as centering in disinterested love. Everything selfish or worldly would come under the rebukes and corrections that they had to offer, as well as everything sinful; for sin, while primarily an offense against duty love, of necessity is an offense also against disinterested love, since the latter implies the former. This stewardship truth will, among other things, account for the singularly unworldly life of the early Methodists. Worldly amusements, like sports, prize fights, games, gambling, dancing, card and other parties, theatre attendances, racing, etc., were strictly forbidden in the Methodist discipline; and the writings of antitypical Pagiel abound in rebukes and corrections of conduct on these lines. And when they were not desisted from, disfellowshipment set in; for he reasoned that for the brethren to become worldly was death to the sanctification that centered in disinterested love, in which reasoning he was doubtless right. Therefore he also inveighed against all acts that implied a panting after human applause, reputation, honor, approval and glory, with their accompanying pomp, show and ostentation, especially if this took the form of desire for man's praise for one's religiousness. Therefore, to live for vainglory and popularity was taboo with antitypical Pagiel, and met his outspoken disapproval, rebuke and correction. If any of the Methodists sought after titles and other human distinctions, antitypical Pagiel corrected them. If they began to show hankering after riches or highly esteemed positions and offices, antitypical Pagiel was sure to rebuke and correct them. If any of them began to show an over-weaning devotion to earthly relatives, even of the family circle, rulers, friends, associates or native land, they were sure to hear from antitypical Pagiel in correction. He treated panting after human knowledge in the same way. Thus he rebuked and corrected worldliness in every form in which he saw

it, because it was a violation of that sanctification that works by disinterested love.

(40) The same course marked his activities toward expressions of selfishness, as distinct from worldliness. Wherever he saw pride parading as arrogance, haughtiness, disdain, conceit, self-assertiveness or self-assurance, he rebuked and corrected it, as opposed to disinterested love. All shams, pretenses and hypocrisies were sure to meet his disapproval and correction, because at variance with true sanctification. All indolence was, for the same reason, rebuked and corrected by him. Whoever betrayed that he loved his life more than God, Christ or the brethren, was corrected as sinning against disinterested love. Inordinate anger, stubbornness, wrath, implacability, unforgiveness, harshness, hardness of heart, as opposed to Divine love, were rebuked and corrected by antitypical Pagiel. Cowardice, especially in the presence of attacks on the Truth, was set forth in its true colors by him. Over-indulgence of appetite, whether along lines of food or drink, fared the same way at his hands. He acted the same way as to sin in all its forms, which, having in connection with antitypical Abidan been described, need not here be repeated. It was his use of that part of his office which required him to correct all—especially sinful—things contrary to his stewardship truth, that made him so mighty in leading many to the "mourner's bench" and to "conversion." He, therefore, certainly suitably offered his charger for the correction of many.

(41) He also offered his bowl—refutative teachings against all teachings opposed to his stewardship doctrine. In his over-emphasis of his stewardship truth in a way that represented the fully sanctified as sinless, he was weak and certainly met defeat in controversy; but in every conflict on the reality of the second state of grace—sanctification, as a thing entirely separate from and beyond justification—and that its heart was disinterested love, he successfully met and refuted all

attacks. On the basis of the separate and distinct Scriptural uses of the words *justification* and *sanctification*, he proved that they were not two words for the same thing, as some contended. He showed it also from the fact that the former was by faith alone, while the latter was by faith and good works. He showed it on the basis of the contrast between the two experiences of Rom. 5: 1, 2. He showed it from the fact that the former is an instantaneous work of God for us, and that the latter is, after its beginning, a life-long work of God in us. He showed that the former is one of the foundational matters for the Christian, while the latter pertains to perfection of a Christian, as shown in Heb. 6: 1, 2. He showed that justification is to do away with the condemnation and power of sin, while sanctification has to do with the sacrifice of the humanity and the perfection of the New Creature; that the former gives peace with God and the latter gives the peace of God; that the former implies giving up sin and doing right and the latter implies giving up self and the world and becoming in all things like Christ. These clear-cut distinctions enabled him to refute all arguments that fused these two acts and later two states into one. While, on the other hand, he showed that disinterested love is the heart of sanctification, because it is the indispensable, all-permeating, always-enduring and greatest grace (1 Cor. 13: 1-13); because its attainment is the purpose of all God's dealings with us, and because its support is in the other great graces (1 Tim. 1: 5); because it witnesses to our begettal of the Spirit (Rom. 5: 5; 1 John 4: 7), to our having life (1 John 3: 14), to our sonship with God (1 John 4: 7), and to our perfection of character (1 John 2: 5; 4: 12), when it is crystallized in us (Phil. 3: 13-16; 1 Pet. 5: 10). Thus, against all opponents he was able to defend refutatively his stewardship truth against all attacks that were launched against it.

(42) Antitypical Pagiel offered his spoon—ethical

teachings, instructions in righteousness. In this respect he had the finest of all ethical teachings to set forth, even more pervasive than the Baptists had, whose disinterested love feature was toward God in its earlier stages; for the greatest of all graces is all-embracing love (1 Cor. 13: 13) . He therefore exhorted that it be given to God, to Christ, to saints, to justified ones and to sinners, whether friendly or inimical. He showed how it produces joy (Ps. 5: 11), is given in answer to prayer (Ps. 116: 1), leads to hatred for sin and practice of obedience (Ps. 97: 10; 1 John 5: 2), gives courage and casts out fear (1 John 4: 17, 18), brings God's approval, constant care, mercy, deliverance and protection (Deut. 7: 9; 1 Cor. 8: 3; Ps. 145: 20; 91: 14; Ex. 20: 6), makes all things work for its possessors' good (Rom. 8: 28), is a proper subject for prayer (2 Thes. 3: 5) and receives God's and Christ's special love (John 14: 21, 23; 16: 27). He encouraged to it by adducing examples of it as it worked in Joseph of Arimathaea (Matt. 27: 57-60), in the penitent woman (Luke 7: 47), in the women at the cross (Luke 23: 28), in Thomas (John 11: 16), in Mary Magdalene (John 20: 11), in Peter, John and Paul (John 21: 15-17; Acts 21: 13). He commended it to his hearers because it is of God (1 John 4: 7), was commanded by God and Christ (1 John 4: 7; John 13: 34; .15: 12), was taught by God (1 Thes. 4: 9), is worked by faith (Gal. 5: 6), is a fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5: 22), purifies the heart (1 Pet. 1: 22), is pertinent to saints (Col. 3: 14), should be abounded and continued in (Phil. 1: 9; Heb. 13: 1), should be encouraged in others (Heb. 10: 24), should be fervent (1 Pet. 4: 8), and all things should be done through it (1 Cor. 16: 14). In giving these instructions, exhortations and encouragements, antitypical Pagiel certainly offered his spoon and a precious one it was; and his instructions therein should do all of us the Divinely intended good; and they surely will if we permit ourselves to be rightly exercised thereby.

(43) We now will study the offerings of the prince of Naphtali, the last tribe on the north of the tabernacle. Naphtali was the second son of Rachel's maid, Bilhah. The name means *wrestling*, and was given to Bilhah's second-born by Rachel, because of the great wrestlings that she had with her sister Leah, and because of her prevailing amid them (Gen. 30: 8). Naphtali represents the Unitario-Universalists. Perhaps it would be better to use for this compound name the single name Unitarians, because Universalists of the sect so called are all Unitarians, though all Unitarians are not Universalists, nor members of the sect so called. So considered, the Universalist sect is to be regarded as a sect of the Unitarian denomination. Therefore in this chapter we will use the name Unitarian to cover both, remarking that, as in the case of the Congregationalists with their principles of church government, the Unitarians have succeeded in convincing many ministers and laymen remaining in other denominations of the correctness of their stewardship doctrine. It is because the Unitarians have had to wrestle in doctrinal controversy so greatly with the exponents of other denominations that the typical name *Naphtali* so well fits them as the antitype of Naphtali and the tribe of Naphtali. Not having the full truth on their stewardship doctrine and its related doctrines, they are not represented by a child of Rachel—the type of the elective Truth and its servants; but being in the pertinent teachings so nearly right, they are appropriately represented as a child of antitypical Bilhah, the maid of antitypical Rachel. So greatly are the Unitarians despised and disfellowshipped by the "orthodox," as not to be counted as evangelical, hence "wrestling."

(44) The prince of Naphtali was called *Ahira*, the son of *Enan*. The word *Ahira is* a compound composed of the words *Ah* and *ra* with *i* inserted between them for euphony's sake. *Ah*, means *brother* and *ra* means

badness or evil. The name, therefore, means *brother of badness* or *evil*. This name primarily designates typically the crown-lost leaders of the Unitarian Church from the standpoint of their so-called "orthodox" theological opponents, who, because the former deny the trinity, human immortality and eternal torment, consider such deniers as the worst of heretics, and most of them even deny that they are Christians. To those who think that trinity, immortality and eternal torment are the foundation truths of the Bible, as the so-called "orthodox" do, naturally the leaders of the Unitarians would be very evil indeed. But to those who are children of antitypical Rachel, the matter appears far otherwise. On the other hand, some of these leaders have gone far into real error, denying, as they have done, the ransom as a corresponding price to satisfy justice, affirming that the atonement does not imply that God must by Christ's merit be made pleased with man, and that God does not hold man off at arm's length in displeasure for his sin, but that man by sin is displeased with God and that atonement implies only this—that man become pleased with God, which, they say, Jesus proposes to work in man. As a matter of fact, the truth on atonement includes both of these ideas. How one-sided and extreme the average religious man is: the "orthodox" stressed one side of the atonement, the Unitarians the other, and each fought the other as in error, which each had the truth that the other lacked! The name *Enan* means *springy*, *fountainlike*, being an adjective derived from the word *ayan*, meaning *spring*, *fountain*, *well*. This likely types the thought that their denial of the three chief teachings of the "orthodox" denominations points out these as the source, spring, of the so-called orthodox teachings.

(45) The man who first of all perverted the Little Flock movement on the unity of the God of Love into a sect was Faustus (not Laelius) Socinus, shortly after the middle of the sixteenth century. Faustus

Socinus was a nephew of Laelius, and got his inspiration in religious life and belief from Laelius Socinus, the latter being the chief assistant of Michael Servetus, the member of antitypical Jacob that started the Little Flock movement on the unity of the God of Love. Faustus, like his uncle before him, had, because of his faith, to flee from the terrors of the Italian inquisition. He first went to Switzerland, thence to Poland, where he found a responsive hearing, and organized a large following. But presently persecution by the Catholics and Calvinists wrought havoc among the Polish Unitarians, and their gradual suppression followed until it was completed there, about the middle of the seventeenth century. In Hungary, about the same time, Unitarianism flourished and later finally outlived persecution. The chief leader of Hungarian Universalists was Franciscus Davidis, able, efficient and a martyr. The next considerable Unitarian movement was organized in England and won over to its stewardship doctrine some of the ablest men of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, most of whom, however remained in the Church of England or among Dissenters. A goodly number of Baptist and Presbyterian churches and ministers joined the English Unitarians. The leading English Unitarian was the distinguished scientist, publicist and theologian, Dr. Priestley. The chief leaders of American Unitarianism were William E. Channing, Andrew Norton and Ezra Abbott. The first was a very able preacher and writer; the second and third were Harvard University professors of worldwide recognized scholarship.

(46) As the name Naphtali implies, these Unitarian leaders have had to deal much in controversy and to bear considerable contempt from their "orthodox" opponents. Very much of Socinus' activities were devoted to polemics, and his writings gave the "orthodox" more than they could handle on antitypical Naphtali's stewardship doctrine, human immortality and eternal

torment. Norton's Statement of Reasons for Unitarian Beliefs, is considered an especially forceful treatise. Ezra Abbott's careful examination of the Biblical texts in the original, pertinent to their stewardship doctrine, on account of his minute and exact scholarship, have made his publications on those texts classics indeed. Despised as they were, the Unitarian leaders, because of their stress on love to God and man, were very kind and mild-mannered in their polemics. So much was this the case that, by contrast with the bruskness of their usual "orthodox" opponents, they were very winsome. Said the learned and respected Archbishop Tillotson of the Church of England of these: "To do right to the writers on that side, I must own that generally they are a pattern of the fair way of disputing and debating matters of religion, without heat and unseemly reflections upon their adversaries. They generally argue matters with that temper and gravity and that freedom from passion and transport, which becomes a serious and weighty argument; and for the most part they reason closely and clearly with extraordinary guard and caution; with great dexterity and decency and yet with smartness and subtility enough; with a very gentle heart and few hard words; virtues to be praised wherever they are to be found, yea, even in an enemy, and very worthy of our imitation." He goes on to say that in comparison with them most controversialists were blunderers and bunglers, and that they did not lack logic, acuteness and feeling, but lacked a good cause. This was quite a compliment from a theological opponent like Archbishop Tillotson.

(47) There has always been a spirit in most Unitarian leaders akin to that of higher critics. Many of them deny our Lord's personal pre-existence; many of them deny His virgin birth, claiming that Joseph or some other man was His father. All of them seem to deny the ransom as a corresponding price for the purchase of the race. We have already shown that they

deny the need of satisfying justice by the corresponding price. Their attitude to the Scriptures is likewise an infidelistic one. The majority of them deny that the Scriptures are inerrant and fully inspired, but hold that while they are not a Divine revelation they contain a Divine revelation, and that what in them is revelatory, and what is not so, must be decided by human reason. Revolting against the Calvinistic error of man's total depravity, they have gone to the opposite extreme, denying man's mental, moral and religious corruption by nature, and claiming that he is by nature goodness itself, only undeveloped. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that almost all Unitarians are higher critics as to the Bible and modernists as to our Lord Jesus. But their emphasis on love in God has moved them to stress love to man; and they are, therefore, very forward in works of benevolence and beneficence. Hence many among them have been very philanthropic, active in reform work of every kind and generous contributors to every humanitarian cause. Their being so much despised by the "orthodox" has hindered their taking a more prominent part in general movements in Christendom, wherever they have wrought.

(48) There is no difficulty in locating the stewardship doctrine of the Unitarians. Their name suggests it. It is, of course, related to the unity of God. It might be stated in the following terms: God is the one supreme Person, whose central attribute is love. They might also state it as follows: God is the one supreme Being, whose central attribute is love. It is because the nominal church, playing hocus-pocus with the word *being*, claims that God is one in being, but three in person, that, to avoid a misunderstanding, they use preferably the term *person* instead of *being* in the definition. The Unitarians, therefore, deny that Jesus is God or a part of God. They likewise deny that the Holy Spirit is a person and is God. To them God is a single, not a compound, unity. This single Divine Person

is, according to them, the supreme Being, whose supreme attribute is not wisdom, or power, or justice, but love. This quality of God that they so greatly stress, more than any other of the qualities of God, proves that by right they are on the North side of the antitypical Tabernacle. Indeed, some of them so one-sidedly emphasize love as an attribute of the Divine character as to teach that He will save all beings—men and devils, yea, Satan himself. They rightly reason that a God of love would not torture any being forever. And this has moved those of them who have not become Universalists to deny that the soul is indestructible, all of them denying eternal torment. Hence, such of them teach that in the future probation, which all of them teach, those who will not reform will be annihilated. The future probation of all of them is not Millennial, as the Bible teaches, but during the death state, which they consider to be a conscious one, but not eternal in duration either for the good or the evil. Thus their soul doctrine was not pure.

(49) It is remarkable that Unitarianism is a protest against the three oldest and most foundational errors of the nominal church—trinitarianism, human immortality and eternal torment. These errors arose in the Smyrna period of the Church, 70-313 A. D. Justin Martyr, who died about 150 A. D., was the introducer of the error of the soul's indestructibility and eternal torment. He was a Platonic philosopher before his conversion to Christianity, and he continued as a Christian to hold Plato's view of the soul. He began the work of amalgamating Christian doctrine and Greek philosophy. He was also the one who began to teach the deifying of Christ in such a way as to start the first tendency of thought toward the doctrine that developed gradually during the next two centuries into the God-man theory as the basis of trinitarianism. While he was one of the earliest apologists of the second century, his philosophy—worldly wisdom—was responsible

for much doctrinal evil, though his two apologies are very useful in proving that all four Gospels were in general use among Christians early in the second century, John's having been written close to the end of the first century. That Unitarians should be the ones to set aside the first and foundational errors of the nominal church should not at all surprise us when we remember their relation to antitypical Rachel. Their stewardship doctrine logically led to their rejecting and refuting these first three, the foundational errors of the nominal church. We are right in calling these three errors the foundational errors of the nominal church, because most of her doctrinal errors and many of her practical errors flow out of, or are supported by these, even as all the true doctrines flow out of, or are supported by the ransom—the hub of the wheel of revelation.

(50) The member of antitypical Jacob whom God used to start the Little Flock movement that crown-lost leaders perverted into the Unitarian Church, was Michael Servetus, who was born at Tudela, in Spain, in 1511, and died at the stake at Geneva in 1553. Very little is known of his early life. His father sent him to Toulouse to study law, and there, in 1528, he began to study the Bible. From 1525 to 1530 he found in Juan de Quintana, a Franciscan monk, a patron. When the latter was, in 1530, promoted to be the confessor of Charles V, the German emperor and Spanish king, Servetus accompanied him as a courtier. He witnessed Charles' crowning at Bologna, Italy, in Feb., 1530, was the same year at the diet of Augsburg, where the Augsburg Confession was read, and probably visited Luther at Coburg, which city was the nearest to the emperor that Luther, as an outlaw and excommunicate, dared approach, while advising the Protestant princes and theologians at Augsburg. The adoration of the pope witnessed by Servetus at Bologna, in 1530, started the latter in an antipapal direction.

He left Quintana, visiting in turn Lyons, France, and Geneva, Switzerland. From Geneva he went to Basel to visit Oecolampadius, and from there went to Strassburg to confer with Bucer and Capito. His first publication, issued in 1531, was entitled, On The Errors Of The Trinity. With this book he began the Little Flock movement antitypical of Jacob's begetting Naphtali. At the date of its publication he was only 20 years of age, and for his age and the times the book was indeed very remarkable. The treatment of the subject was serious and original, and proved that his preparatory reading was on a vast scale. The subject matter was so unusual and logical that the ablest thinkers of the day were compelled to give it careful attention, and were at great pains to meet his arguments. Melanchthon said of this book: "I read Servetus much." Quintana, his former patron, spoke of him as of a very great genius and a great sophist, declaring that the sentiments were doubtless those of Servetus, but he thought that the book was too well written to be his. In 1532 Servetus set forth a revised presentation of his views in the form of a dialogue. To write against the trinity was at that time an extremely dangerous thing, and Servetus was compelled to flee for safety from Germany to France, where he was little known.

(51) Servetus next turned up at Lyons, France, in 1535, using as his surname, not Servetus, but Villanovanus, based on the name of his father's birth place. By this name he continued to call himself until he was arrested at Geneva in 1553. At Lyons he busied himself by editing scientific works for the Trechsel firm. Here he found another patron, Dr. Champier. This association with Champier led him to decide to study medicine. To this end he resorted to Paris (1536) and studied under the most able medical professors there. Here, too, in 1536, he met Calvin, who was giving a hurried and final visit to Paris, his Protestantism making

it dangerous for him to remain longer in France. Calvin sought, to use his own expression, to set Servetus right on the trinity. To this end he challenged the latter to a debate; but fear that he would be delivered by Calvin to the authorities as a heretic moved Servetus not to put in an appearance at the place of debate. Servetus became the assistant of his chief professor. The latter highly praised his learning and his skill in dissection and said that he was in his knowledge second to none of the greatest medical authorities. He graduated in arts and medicine, published six lectures on syrups, lectured at the University on geometry and astrology. For the latter he was sued by the medical faculty. In 1538 he was at the Louvain University as a student. His studies there were theology and Hebrew. Thereafter, for a short time, he practiced medicine at Avignon, France, and for a longer time at Charlieu. In Sept., 1540, he entered, as a student, the medical school at Montpellier for further development in his professional studies. To illustrate to what proficiency he attained in the medical profession, it should be stated that he discovered the fact of the lesser circulation of the blood—the passage of the blood from the right to the left side of the heart through the lungs by the pulmonary artery and vein, and its further transmission from the left ventricle of the heart to the arteries of the body, two facts that were basal to Harvey's discovery of the full circulation of the blood nearly a century later.

(52) While he lectured at Paris, one of his students was Pierre Paulmier, who was since 1528 the Archbishop of Vienne, France. In 1541 he invited Servetus to come to Vienne as his private physician, which he was from 1541 to 1553. Here he engaged in the general practice of medicine as well, and also in editorial work for publishers in Lyons. While, to all outward appearance, he was a Catholic, he continued privately his study of the Scriptures. Rejecting infant baptism,

and believing that as Jesus was baptized at 30 so he also should be then baptized, he underwent this symbol in 1541. Late in 1545 or early in 1546 he began the correspondence with Calvin that was to have so tragic an ending for Servetus. He sent Calvin an enlarged revision of his former publications. Their letters were long debates. Servetus offered to visit Calvin at Geneva. The latter declined (Feb. 13, 1546), saying that it would be harder than he could bear. The same day he wrote to his preacher friend, Farel: "If he should come, if my authority may avail, I will never suffer him to go away alive." Similar sentiments he expressed in a letter to Pierre Viret, another of his preacher friends. Servetus was warned by someone not to trust himself in Calvin's hands at Geneva; for, writing to his friend, Abel Pouppin, about 1547, he complains that Calvin would not return his manuscript, adding: "I know of a certainty that I would have to die for this matter." Again, recasting his book, he offered it to two Basel publishers who, at Calvin's instance, refused to publish it. The book was entitled, The Restoration Of True Christianity. Servetus finally, at Vienne, found a publisher who was willing to print it secretly. It was ready for circulation Jan. 3, 1553; and the bulk of the copies were privately sent to Lyons and Frankfort. Servetus made the mistake of sending Calvin a copy of the book, and the. latter, after giving, in 1550, incriminating information to the Catholic Inquisition at Lyons, against Servetus, fully betrayed to that tribunal its author, even furnishing samples of Servetus' handwriting to the inquisitors, and upbraiding them for their lack of zeal in suffering so great a heretic to live, after they had received proofs of his guilt three years before. The inquisitor-general of Lyons took up the case, March 12th, questioned Servetus, March 16th, arrested him, April 4th, and examined him the two following days. Knowing that he was sure to be condemned to be burned, he arranged for and succeeded

the early morning of April 7th in making his escape from the prison where he was held. For four months he was in hiding in France, not daring to show himself anywhere.

(53) On Sunday, August 13, 1553, he entered Geneva, expecting to leave that' day by boat on his journey toward Zurich, on his way to Naples. No boat being that day available, he went to Church, where he was recognized by Calvin, who had not seen him for 17 years, and who immediately caused his arrest and imprisonment. His trial on the charge of heresy was begun Aug. 14th, under the Justinian code, which was not legally operative at Geneva, it having been some time before abolished as the law of Geneva, and there being no law operative in Geneva at the time applicable to such a case. Moreover, he was not a citizen of Switzerland, but merely a traveler passing through to another destination. Furthermore, he had committed no offense on Swiss soil. These facts show the gross violations of law and justice involved in his arrest, trial and sentence. At first a servant of Calvin appeared as the accuser and prosecutor; then, throwing away the mask that he wore, Calvin openly stood forth as his accuser and prosecutor. The trial lasted until Oct. 26—about 2½ months, and consisted almost exclusively of theological debates between Servetus and Calvin. On the subject of God's being but one person and of Christ's not being God, Servetus thoroughly refuted Calvin; but the latter as thoroughly refuted Servetus on Christ's pre-human existence, Servetus denying our Lord's personal pre-existence. As Christians, we deplore the bloodthirsty spirit that Calvin betrayed throughout this trial. There was a considerable minority party among the judges, who favored Servetus' acquittal. A number of the Swiss Reformed churches were requested for their opinion as to whether Servetus was a heretic. While passing unfavorable judgment, all these churches thought that banishment would

be the sentence. Calvin had no such thought. He deliberately planned to secure Servetus' death, even as in 1546 he had told Farel that he would exert his authority to the utmost to secure it, if he would ever lay hand on him. The majority of the judges, at Calvin's insistence, rendered a capital sentence under a law not operative in their land, for an act not committed in their country and on a person not subject to their authority. Calvin weakly interceded to have the sentence of burning changed into beheading; but the majority of the court would not change it, assured that it was not greatly desired.

(54) On Oct. 27, 1553, the day after the condemnation, Servetus was burned. Farel, who was absent from the trial, at his home, was sent for, and was appointed to minister to, and accompany Servetus to the stake in an effort to secure his recantation, and to prepare him for death, all the Genevan ministers, as implicated in securing his condemnation, being considered unfavorable persons for such a task. Farel, of course, failed in his efforts; but at the end of the melancholy affair, overcome by the heroic and Christ-like spirit of the martyr, he remarked that he considered that Servetus was perhaps a Christian and saved. First Servetus was brought before his judges, who had the sentence read in his and a great multitude's presence. They then rejected his plea to change the sentence to beheading. Then he was taken some distance from the city to a field at Campel, where he was secured to a block on which he was made to sit, amid the execrations of the multitude. Instead of securing well-dried fagots, which would quickly burn and soon put the victim out of his misery, green timber was used. Furthermore, instead of piling these fagots closely around him to insure speedy death, they were placed at some distance from him, with the result that he was designedly subjected to a slow roasting of over a half hour's duration. In mockery—like the crown of thorns

that was placed on the Lord's brow—a chaplet of straw and green twigs, besprinkled with brimstone, was made to encircle his head. The flame was first applied to the fagots and then flashed in his face, which ignited the brimstone on his head and drew forth such a cry of anguish from the victim as to strike terror to the hearts of the spectators. This was his only cry. For the rest he suffered in silence with a courage born of his faith. His last words were, "Jesus, Thou Son of the Eternal God, have mercy on me! " These words were a confession of his faith, maintained unto the end of a horrible martyr death. Mark well: he did not pray, Jesus, Thou Eternal Son of God, as a trinitarian might pray; but his final prayer was a confession of the faith that he held and taught—that the Father alone is God, and that Jesus Christ is His Son, not God Himself.

(55) We have already in Chapter III shown what Servetus' encounter with Calvin antitypes, from the standpoint of the test put upon a guilty suspected woman. The Reformed—Presbyterian—Church, by this encounter, was demonstrated to have been untrue to the heavenly Bridegroom, by the antitypical swollen belly—error—and the shrunken thigh—wrong action. The errors on the trinity in Calvin and his colaborers, as representatives of that Church, were manifest in his debate with Servetus, and were the antitypical swollen belly; and his and their bringing Servetus to the stake and approving it was the wrong conduct antitypical of the shrunken thigh. The union of church and state at Geneva, etc., was the act of infidelity in the Reformed Church. Doubtless Calvin's zeal for his teachings was a moving cause of his persecuting Servetus; but he, himself, confessed that if Servetus had spoken more respectfully to him, he would not have insisted so perseveringly on his being capitally punished. Thus religious intolerance and personal spite animated Calvin, and proved his part in the shrunken thigh of the church

that he dominated. Its justifying his acts proves its shrunken thigh. Calvin, having been so long accustomed to the obsequious deference of all with whom he came in contact, could not bear Servetus' very plain characterizings of him and his refusal to defer to him. When we keep the type in mind we are sure the Lord desired no such deference shown to Calvin, a crown-loser, by Servetus, a crown-retainer, while the former stood and acted as the chief representative of one espoused to the Lord and guilty of infidelity. Doubtless, the persecuting spirit of the age, from which Calvin could not wholly fiee himself, palliates his conduct; but we must not forget that for years he had been a denouncer of the papal spirit of persecution, and had addressed a noble publication, in defense of religious tolerance, to the king of France. Alas, for human inconsistency! The advocate for tolerance while persecuted, when in power, tested on that question, forgot his eloquent and logical pleas and blackened his character and reputation with one of the greatest individual examples of intolerance and cruelty in Protestant annals. We close this melancholy subject with rejoicing in the Lord for Servetus' loyalty, and with tears for Calvin's fall.

(56) We have given enough on Servetus to show his place in the Lord's arrangement. We now proceed to show how, on the basis of his teaching that God is but one person, whose central attribute is love, antitypical Ahira offered his charger, bowl and spoon. His charger was the correction of all conduct against this teaching. It, therefore, rebuked and corrected the conduct of all who make any other being or thing equal to the Father, which all Trinitarians do with the Son and with the Holy Spirit. He designated this a violation of the first commandment. And because in the practice of the nominal church, our Lord is actually loved more than the Father, he rebuked and corrected this practice. This charger consisted of corrections

of Mariolatry, which in practice, though not in theory, exalts Mary to superiority in love to the Son and the Father. He corrected the insult offered the Father by those who from the trinitarian viewpoint degraded the Father to equality with an inferior—a thing that was one of Satan's purposes in inventing the trinity doctrine. He corrected the conduct of those who by hocus-pocus methods befuddled the heads and hurt the hearts of their followers, by teaching them the mystifications of trinitarianism. He also rebuked and corrected such teachers for making people credulous of unexplainable, unprovable and self-contradictory teachings. This led him to correct the superstition and superstition-developing propensity of belief in such a doctrine. It, likewise, occasioned his correcting the conduct of those who taught the doctrine of the soul's immortality, as a violation of the love of God. He charged them with blasphemy in setting forth that teaching. He warmly corrected the conduct of those who taught eternal torment, charging them with glaring blasphemy against the one God of perfect love. He corrected their pertinent blasphemy, charging that their theory makes the one God of love act more cruelly than the devil himself. Thus, they forcibly repudiated and corrected the slanders, blasphemies, misrepresentations and caricatures of God's character for which trinitarianism is responsible.

(57) Not only so, but he corrected all conduct in man that did not imitate, but violated the love that the Father exercises and cherishes. God's disinterested love is a delight in good principles, a delight in and a sympathetic oneness with those whose characters are in harmony with good principles, a pity for all whose characters are out of harmony with good principles or who are treated out of harmony with good principles and a sacrificing spirit exercised for the advancement of good principles. Thus, love is involved in the stewardship doctrine of Unitarianism. Consequently,

antitypical Ahira's charger corrects all human conduct violative of such love—disinterested, as distinct from duty love. This fact made him correct every feature of selfishness and worldliness that we pointed out as being corrected by antitypical Pagiel, as well as every feature of sin that the latter pointed out. By so doing he showed that his place was properly at the North side of the antitypical Tabernacle. It will not be necessary to give the details on his corrections of the various phases of selfishness, worldliness and sin; for that would be merely repeating what we have already pointed out in the chargers of the three preceding princes. But this activity should, as a part of antitypical Ahira's charger, be mentioned here in a general way, that we may properly see how extensive his charger has been.

(58) Antitypical Ahira offered his bowl—refutative teachings against opposing doctrines used to attack his. He first showed that the doctrine of the trinity is a contradiction in terms of that of God's unity—three cannot be one! Then he showed that the doctrine that Christ is both God and man is also a contradiction in terms. And he showed that neither doctrine is claimed to be taught in express words of Scripture, but is based on inference contradictory to clear Scripture. He then proved from Scripture that Christ is not God: (1) from the passages that the "orthodox" quoted to prove that He is (John 17: 5; 1: 1, 2; Col. 1: 15; Phil. 2: 5-8; Heb. 1: 1-4, 8, 9); (2) from passages where Jesus denies that He is God (John 8: 28, 29, 54; 5: 19, 26, 36; 6: 57; 12: 49, 50; 14: 24, 10; 10: 37); (3) from the whole tenor of the Bible, which puts God above Him and Him below God: (4) from the source of the doctrine being, not Scripture, but Platonic philosophy. The "orthodox" claim that prayer offered to Christ proves Him God, they answered by showing that His exaltation to God's right hand as His Vicegerent justifies our praying to Him as God's representative. The

"orthodox" claim that His pre-existence proves that Christ was God, the few Unitarians who have held Christ's personal pre-existence have answered by pointing out that He was subordinate to God before He became the man Christ Jesus. The "orthodox" refer to passages that refer to His authority, power, attributes and works, as proofs of His being God. Antitypical Ahira showed that these were His as God's Vicegerent and, therefore, do not prove Him to be God. He then took up the passages used to prove the trinity and showed that they did not prove it: (1) Some were interpolations or corrupted passages (Acts 20: 28; 1 Tim. 3: 16; 1 John 5: 7); (2) Some were mistranslations (Phil. 2: 5; John 1: 1, 2); (3) Some refer to God and are incorrectly applied to Christ (Rom. 9: 5; 1 John 5: 20); (4) Though some refer in the same connection to the Father, Son and Spirit, they do not speak of them as a trinity (Matt. 28: 19; 1 Cor. 12: 4-6; 2 Cor. 13: 13). Thus antitypical Ahira met and refuted arguments adduced to prove that Christ is God and that God is a trinity. It will not be necessary to set forth his refutation of the soul's immortality and eternal torment, which arguments our readers well know. In so doing, he offered his bowl—refutative teachings, and successfully defended his stewardship doctrine.

(59) He, likewise, offered his spoon—instructions in righteousness—ethical teachings. His stewardship doctrine ably lent itself to instructions in righteousness, because God's love is the great example set before the Lord's people for their imitation. This enabled antitypical Ahira to stress love toward God, Christ, the brethren, the world and enemies. God's great love to saint and sinner became the ground of his exhortations to love the brethren, the world and enemies. This will also account for the great efforts that Unitarians have made to express practically their love to their fellows. As we set the details of this forth in connection with

the spoon of the preceding two princes, we will not elaborate on it further here, as the remarks would be largely repetitions of those expressed earlier in this chapter.

(60) Hitherto we have studied the offerings of the twelve groups of crown-lost leaders—one group for each of the twelve denominations of Christendom—as these are typically set forth in Num. 7: 1-83: At first we gave details of their united offerings (vs. 1-11), then a discussion treating of their separate offerings (vs. 12-83). We now purpose to study vs. 84-89. These verses give us a summary combination of their separate offerings as a whole. Accordingly, an explanation of these verses will partake more or less of the character of a summary of vs. 12-83. The first clause of v. 84 were better rendered as follows: "These were the dedication-*gifts* of the altar," *i.e.*, what follows gives us a summary of the dedication gifts that the twelve princes brought. The altar here referred to is the golden altar, representing the Church as New Creatures during the Gospel Age, comforting, strengthening, encouraging, etc., the sacrificing Priesthood. Its anointing types the bestowment by God, upon the comforting, strengthening, encouraging, etc., Church, of the qualities of heart and mind fitting it for its pertinent service. The completion of such anointing before the princes offered represents the thought that the Little Flock brethren in each of the twelve Little Flock movements, later perverted into twelve sects by the crown-lost leaders, had in each of the twelve movements experienced their anointing to a completion before the crown-lost leaders perverted the pertinent movement into a sect. Thus, *e.g.*, the Little Flock brethren led by Ulrich Zwingli started a movement on the basis of the stewardship doctrine that the Lord's Supper symbolizes our appropriation of Christ's merit by faith and our fellowship with one another; and all the Little Flock's participants in this movement had

their anointing completed for that movement's work before it was perverted into the denomination variously called, the Reformed Church, the Presbyterian Church, etc. So was this the case with the Little Flock brethren in the other eleven Little Flock movements later perverted into sects by the eleven crown-lost groups of brethren.

(61) Grouping the antitypes according to the order of the tabernacle picture, we now enumerate each of the twelve involved stewardship doctrines, its leading Little Flock proponent and the chief crown-lost perverter, as follows: (1) The Lord's Supper is a symbolic representation of faith appropriating Jesus' merit, and the common-union of the saints. This doctrine was made by Ulrich Zwingli the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, chiefly by John Calvin, perverted into the Reformed or Presbyterian Church. (2) The Bible as the Christian's faith is the center of unity for God's people. This doctrine was by Barton Stone made the basis of a Little Flock movement which, chiefly by Alexander Campbell, was perverted into the Christian or Disciple Church. (3) The Bible times and seasons mightily work along the lines of prophetic chronology. This doctrine was by William Miller made the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, mainly by Joshua Hines, perverted into the Second Advent Church. (4) Christ in His pre-human, human and post-human conditions has been God's official Special Representative in God's works. This doctrine was by the Apostle John made the basis of a Little Flock movement which, mainly by Origen, was perverted into the Greek Catholic Church. (5) The one entire Church is the steward of God's Truth, to preserve it from error and to minister it to the responsive. This doctrine was by Irenaeus made the basis of a Little Flock movement which, mainly by Augustine, was perverted into the Roman Catholic Church. (6) The Church in the flesh is subject to the civil powers. This doctrine was

by Thomas Cranmer made the basis of a Little Flock movement which, especially by Queen Elizabeth, was perverted into the Episcopal Church. (7) Justification is by God's grace through faith alone in Christ's merit. This doctrine was by Martin Luther made the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, mainly by John, the Steadfast, the Elector of Saxony, perverted into the Lutheran Church. (8) Each ecclesia is, under Christ, the mistress of its own affairs, independent of all outside religious control, but one in the sevenfold tie of Christian unity with other Christian ecclesias and individuals. This doctrine was by Robert Browne made the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, mainly by Henry Barrows, perverted into the Congregational Church. (9) True religion is supreme love to God and equal love to the neighbor. This doctrine was by George Fox made the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, mainly by William Penn, perverted into the Quaker or Friends' Church. (10) The Lord's people are those only who are justified and consecrated. This doctrine was by Balthasar Hubmaier made the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, mainly by Menno Simonis perverted into the Baptist Church. (11) Disinterested love, as the heart of sanctification, is the Divine ideal for the Lord's people. This doctrine was by John Wesley made the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, mainly by Dr. Thomas Coke, perverted into the Methodist Church. (12) The one God is love. This doctrine was by Michael Servetus made the basis of a Little Flock movement which was, mainly by Faustus Socinus, perverted into the Unitarian Church.

(62) Above we have given a summary of the twelve stewardship doctrines of the twelve denominations, together with the names of the twelve main Little Flock brothers who used them to start Little Flock movements, and the names of the twelve main crown-losers in the twelve antitypical princes. As there were more

than one Little Flock brother working in each of the pertinent movements, so there were more than one crown-loser in each antitypical prince. All of such Little Flock brothers in each movement were the antitypical altar (v. 84). As they faithfully served in, and during the time of the pertinent movement, they received their anointing to a completion (in the day when it was anointed). The dedication gifts of twelve chargers (v. 84) type the twelve sets of teachings, each of which were corrective of misconduct, and which suggested such correctives of misconduct. They constituted a very large body of corrections, covering in their aggregate almost every phase of wrong behavior. The dedication gifts of twelve bowls (v. 84) type twelve sets of teachings, each of which were refutative of all attacks made on the pertinent stewardship doctrine, which attacks occasioned a very large body of refutations, covering in the aggregate almost every phase of opposition to the pertinent stewardship doctrine. The dedication gifts of twelve spoons (v. 84)type twelve sets of ethical teachings, upbuilding to the characteristics suggested by the pertinent stewardship doctrine and growing into a large body of ethics covering almost every phase of character building.

(63) V. 13 and corresponding verses in Num. 7 show that the chargers and bowls were silver, and v. 14 and corresponding verses in this chapter show that the spoons of all the princes were gold. As we have long since learned, in Biblical symbols silver represents Truth, and gold represents that which is Divine. The thought with reference to the chargers and the bowls is, therefore, that *truth* characterized the corrections of wrong qualities and conduct and the refutations of errors, made by the teachings of the antitypical princes in their pertinent views; while the thought with reference to the golden spoon is that the antitypical princes' ethical teachings were Divine in that they came from God, in that they inured to developing a Divine character,

in that they tended to glory, honor and immortality, and in that they enhanced the Divine glory. The weight of these three vessels—the charger 130, the bowl 70, and the spoon 10 shekels of the sanctuary—totaled 210 shekels. It will be noted that each vessel's weight in shekels was in the denomination of ten or its multiples—130, 70, 10. This symbolizes the fact that they were offerings of those who would ultimately be of a nature lower than the Divine, ten and its multiples symbolizing natures lower than the Divine. But their sum, 210, being a multiple of both 7 and 10, suggests the thought that though their offerers will ultimately be of a nature lower than the Divine, they once were begotten to the Divine nature as New Creatures, having had crowns assigned to them. The weight of the spoon—10 shekels—suggests typically the new-creaturely powers of its offerer as being less than Divine; the weight of the bowl—70 shekels, the product of 7 and 10-suggests typically that Divine New Creatures in reckonedly perfect human bodies were its offerers; and the weight of the charger-130 shekels, 130 being the sum of 70 and 60, the later a multiple of 6, the symbol of evil and imperfection, and of 10, the symbol here of human nature, 60 thus representing corrupt human nature—typically represents that it would be double-minded (Jas. 1: 8), Spirit-begotten persons who would offer the antitypical charger. Thus embedded in the weights of these vessels are typical allusions to various outstanding features of the crown-losers. Thus in another way than that of their sharing in the Sin-offering, does the Lord show us that the princes type crown-lost leaders. The *silver* charger and the bowl in *contrast* with the *golden* spoon seems also to represent the thought that the value of the corrective and refutative teachings was inferior to that of the ethical teachings for Divine purposes—the development of God's people!

(64) V. 85 not only gives the weight of each charger

(130 shekels) and of each bowl (70 shekels), but also gives their total weight in the offerings of the twelve princes. This is 2,400 shekels. Now 2,400 is 12 times the sum of 6 x 10, 7 x 10 and 7 x 10, *i.e.*, 200. The thought seems to be that the things symbolized by these figures as given in the preceding paragraph are found in all the crown-losers of all the tribes combinedly. These things are a totality for all the denominational good and imperfection. Each and all of them in the princes have the same advantages and disadvantages, the same good things and evil or imperfect things, 2,400 being a multiple of six, while in some of its component combinations the numbers 7 and 10 are found, types the fact that all of the offerings of all the antitypical princes fall short of the degree of sacrificial excellence required in those of the Little Flock, this thought also being derived from the fact that 2,400 is not a multiple of 7. The expression, shekel *of the sanctuary*, implies the sacred use to which the things symbolized were put.

(65) In v. 86 the only new thought given beyond what had previously been set forth in Num. 7 is that of the combined weight of. the twelve spoons. While the ten shekels' weight of each spoon implies that the offerers will be of a lower nature than the Divine, the total weight of all twelve spoons—120 shekels—suggests several things: As a multiple of six, the thought of evil or imperfection in the offerers is implied in this number; again, the thought that the aggregate of the princes' offering falls short of the sacrificial excellence of the Little Flock's work, is evident from the fact that 120 is not a multiple of 7. It will be noticed that the weight of all 12 bowls, chargers and spoons is 2,520 shekels. This might be intended to suggest the thought of the Times of the Gentiles—2,520 years—from the standpoint that after the end of the Gentile Times no more offerings of the crown-lost leaders would be *accepted* by God as belonging to their Gospel-Age offerings.

If this is true, our answer to the first question in P '26, 173, will have to be so understood as limiting the time of the acceptableness of such offerings to 1914 as its end, though, of course, they have still been giving forth the pertinent teachings, without God's accepting them after 1914. This seems necessitated by the fact that the Great Company as such began to be dealt with Sept. 20, 1914. The fact that the Little Flock workers in the twelve movements in which they shared, though consisting of different individuals in each movement, are represented by one, and not twelve altars, types the oneness of their antitypes in these several works; while the crown-losers, as princes of the twelve denominations, being represented by twelve princes, types the fact that the antitypical princes would not be one in spirit, but would differ in spirit somewhat as their respective denominations so differ.

(66) The following repetition of a former explanation will serve to clarify our comments on the twelve-fold burnt-offerings, sin-offerings and peace-offerings. Vs. 15-17 show the animal sacrifices of the princes in three forms: the burnt-offering, the sin-offering and the peace-offering. As our dear Pastor has shown us, the burnt-offering represents the manifested acceptableness of the sacrifice to Jehovah; the sin-offering, the atoning character of the sacrifice; and the peace-offering, the covenant obligations which were assumed, and which were fulfilled by the sacrifice. We understand the young bullock in the burnt-offering to type our Lord as the one whose merit is the basis of the manifested acceptableness of the sacrifice; the ram to type the Church as the one whose sacrifice includes that of the crown-losers before 1917, and thus is instrumental in making the crown-losers' sacrifice available as a part of its own; and the lamb to type the manifested acceptableness of the crown-losers to Jehovah through Christ's merit and their inclusion in the Church. In the first part of Chapter IV, discussing the

individual offerings of the Gospel-Age princes, we explained the antitypical significance of the kid of the goats as a sin-offering (v. 16). V. 17 names a number of the beasts sacrificed in the peace-offering. We understand the antitype to be: Through Christ's merit (the two oxen) and on account of their inclusion in the Church (the five rams) as a part of the sin-offering (the five he goats), the sacrifices of the crown-losers are a fulfilment of their consecration vows (the five lambs). The fact that the lamb in the burnt-offering and in the peace-offering was of one year in each case, types the maturity of the crown-losers for the sacrificial work that they performed. We have already used the fact of the princes bringing the sin-offering as proving that certain Gospel-Age sacrificers, and hence crown-lost new creatures, are typed by them. The same thought flows from the fact that they bring a burnt-offering; for the only sacrifice manifested as acceptable to Jehovah, and made during the Gospel Age, is that of the Christ. So, too, the same conclusion follows from the fact that they brought the peace-offering; for the only sacrificial covenant made and fulfilled during the Gospel Age is that of the Christ. The same thought flows from the fact that a special animal in the burnt- and peace-offerings types them as distinct from Jesus and the Church. Thus we have found seven arguments which prove that the princes represent the crown-lost sectarian leaders in the Gospel-Age picture: (1) they offered a sin-offering; (2) they offered vessels whose shekel weight was of ten or its multiples, and whose total shekel weight was 210 shekels, and whose separate weights and combinations type reckonedly perfect human beings, Spirit-begotten human beings and double-minded new creatures; (3) they offered gold and silver vessels; (4) these vessels belonged to the golden altar; (5) they brought a burnt-offering; (6) they brought a peace-offering; and (7) they are typed in the burnt—and peace-offerings by an

animal separate and distinct from the animals that type the Christ.

(67) Wherever in vs. 87 and 88 the twelve-foldedness or the multiple of twelve-foldedness as including the number 6 in the sacrifices typing Christ's sacrifice (12 and 24 oxen) is given, it is not to indicate any imperfection in our Lord's sacrifice, but that His sacrifice made acceptable the twelve imperfect sacrifices of the twelve sets of crown-losers. Wherever the twelve-foldedness or its multiples as including the number 6 (12 rams and goats; 60 rams and goats) in the sacrifice of the Church is indicated in these verses, not imperfection in the Church's sacrifice is thereby typed, but the imperfect sacrifices of the twelve sets of crown-losers, as included in the Church's sacrifice, is thereby represented. The last sentence of v. 88 emphasizes the fact that the princes' offerings were brought *after* the altar was anointed. This is to show us that in the antitype the Little Flock brethren who served in the twelve movements that were perverted into sects by the crown-losers in every case had gotten their complete anointing before their respective movements were sectarianized by the crown-losers.

(68) Our present study is mainly a brief summary" of the preceding twelve, as that summary is typically set forth in vs. 84-88. It, therefore, serves mainly as a review of our study on The Offerings of the Gospel-Age Princes. As such we trust it will refresh our minds on the things already learned. Surely Num. 7 is a remarkable type-prophecy of a wonderful series of Gospel-Age events and is another evidence to Epiphany-enlightened saints of the depths of wisdom and foreknowledge that God has placed in His Word. And this wisdom and foreknowledge becomes all the more remarkable when we consider that these types have an Epiphany and a Millennial application. "O depth of riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! "

(69) Between the account of the Princes' offerings

and the account of the cleansing and consecration of the Levites, the Lord has set forth two items that show how God revealed His will to Moses (Num. 7: 89), and how He arranged for Aaron to light the candlestick (Num. 8: 1-4) . We are told in v. 89 that Moses went into the Most Holy whenever he desired information from God and that God spoke to him by an audible voice from between the cherubim and above the mercy seat, *i.e.*, from the glory similitude which represented Him. This account shows that God did not speak to Moses as He did to the high priest—by means of the urim and thummim (Num. 27: 21; 1 Sam. 28: 6) . Nor did He speak to Moses by dreams, visions, dark speeches and similitudes, as He did to the prophets; but He spoke to him face to face (Num. 12: 6-8). Thus we see that God and Moses carried on audible conversations with one another (Ex. 25: 22). It was during and through these conversations that God revealed His will and word to Moses for Israel. This account of v. 89, being a part of the Law, was, like every other thing connected with the Law, a type of coming good things (Heb. 10: 1) . Moses, among other things, was a type of Christ (Heb. 3: 1-6; 11: 26; 1 Cor. 10: 2). As the leader of Israel, in contrast with Aaron as high priest, for the Gospel Age he types our Lord as God's Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader of spiritual Israel to antitypical Canaan. Such is his typical use in Num. 7: 89; for here he appears as Israel's leader, acting as God's executive and mouthpiece, in contrast with Aaron as high priest, who is treated of in this connection as such.

(70) Moses' being in the holy of holies, as v. 89 shows him to have been, types our Lord in His Spirit-born condition in heaven (Heb. 9: 24) . Moses' being in the most holy in order to inquire as to God's will or word with reference to Israel in its various relations, types our Lord's getting from the Father whatever His will or thought may be in connection with every interest

of God's people. This implies that our Lord gets all of the Truth and works for Jehovah's plan and its execution from the Father. It is still true of Him, as it was in the days of His flesh, that whatever He reveals to us or does for us is not invented by Himself, but is received by Him from the Father (John 14: 10; 5: 12; 7: 16). He does not, like many others, boast of originating His thoughts and acts. Just as Moses always had access to the most holy and got a hearing from the Lord whenever it was necessary for His office work as God's executive, mouthpiece and leader for Israel, so our Lord always can approach the Father at every requirement of His office as God's Gospel-Age Executive, etc. As the Voice of God always answered Moses upon such occasions, so the Father always speaks to the Son in the antitype. As Moses always gave the Lord's responses to others whenever this was due to be given them, so does our Lord in the antitype do with Jehovah's responses. Sometimes Moses was given information for his exclusive use, *e.g.*, when he asked to see God (Ex. 33: 18—34: 9), when he was instructed as to how to deal with Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Nom. 16: 5-33), etc. In such cases he did what he was told, without explaining his actions to Israel, the Levites, or priests. So, too, our heavenly Father directs our Lord to do certain things in the carrying out of the Plan, and to let us know nothing of them. Frequently, some things have never been explained to those who observed the facts. But all things that are contained in the types, prophecies and dark sayings of the Bible, will, before the Epiphany will have ended, be made known to us. Thus we see that our Lord in His capacity as being antitypical Moses, as God's Gospel-Age Executive, etc., has gotten all of the Truth that He has revealed to us, and all of the works that he has done in the carrying out of God's Plan, from the heavenly Father. This is one great truth that we learn from Num. 7: 89.

(71) Very meaningful is the typology as to how God spoke to Moses. It is stated that the Voice spoke from above the ark's mercy seat and from between the cherubim. Properly did our Pastor teach that the mercy seat types justice—righteousness. This is very apparent from the fact that the propitiating blood was sprinkled upon it, *i.e.*, justice was the thing that was given propitiation, as it necessarily should have been, since it was dissatisfied with letting the sinner live and could only then let Him live, if propitiation was made for him, which the blood on the mercy seat wrought. It is also evident from the fact that our Lord in His human perfection, righteousness, is called the propitiatory (not "propitiation"), mercy seat, in Rom, 3: 25. Additionally, in this connection his [human] faithfulness, righteousness, is shown to be the thing that propitiates—His perfect justice satisfied justice; and it is also called God's righteousness, because God provided it, and because it is the same in principle as God's righteousness. The two cherubim overshadowing the mercy seat are also mentioned. Our Pastor has rightly defined these as God's power and love. The symbolism of their eyes being directed to the blood-sprinkled mercy seat and of their wings outstretched, suggests this, because as soon as, and only as soon as, power and love recognize justice as satisfied with it can and do they fly to deliver the pertinent reconciled ones. It is further evident from the name, cherubim *of glory*, that St. Paul gives them (Heb. 9: 5). In the Bible the word *glory* has, among other things, a very fine meaning for this line of thought; for it refers to perfection of character. When we speak of the glory of God, we are not to understand a literal light or splendor, but the spiritual splendor of His holy character to be meant (Num. 14: 21; Ps. 96: 3; Is. 40: 5; 60: 1; Rom. 3: 23; 1 Cor. 11: 7; Tit. 2: 13) . Repeatedly is the word *glory* used in the sense of a character like God's (Rom. 2: 7, 10; 5: 2; 2 Cor. 3: 18; 1 Pet. 1: 7; 4: 14).

These considerations prove that the expression, cherubim *of glory*, refers to two of the leading attributes of God. The two leading attributes of God that wait on, and act after propitiation is made are, of course, power and love. When we shall shortly show how the wisdom of God is symbolized in connection with the ark, the proof conclusive that the two cherubim represent God's power and love will be given, we trust.

(72) The fourth thing that was above the chest of the ark—the mercy seat and the two cherubim being three of the four—was the Shekinah, a non-Biblical Hebrew word meaning, *that which dwells*, used to designate the glory, as the representation of God, dwelling between the cherubim (Num. 12: 8; 1 Sam. 4: 4; 2 Sam. 6: 2; Ps. 99: 1). Some have mistakenly taken this glory to represent wisdom. But repeatedly the Bible speaks of God as dwelling between the cherubim, and by this expression evidently means this glory as the representation, "similitude, of the Lord" (Num. 12: 8). Hence it does not represent wisdom. Certainly, we are not to understand that God in His body dwelt between the cherubim; for His body was in heaven. Evidently the expression, "similitude of the Lord," means a representation of the Lord. Thus the glory between the cherubim and above the mercy seat was a representation of God. This use of language is very much like that connected with our Lord's appearing to Saul of Tarsus near Damascus. Saul did not really see our Lord's glorified body, which "no man hath seen, nor can see" (1 Tim. 6: 15); but he did see a vision, a representation (Acts 26: 19), of it in the glory that, shining out of it, blinded him before his eyes could penetrate it to the body out of which it came, and which it represented. So we are not to understand that the Shekinah was God; rather that it was a representation of God. But if the Shekinah does not represent wisdom, is not wisdom represented in

connection with the upper part of the ark, where justice, power and love, as we have just seen, are represented? We answer, Yes. The light which that glorious Shekinah radiated represents wisdom (Ps. 80: 1; 97: 11; John 1: 9; comp. 1 Cor. 1: 30) . Thus we see that above the chest part of the ark, which represents the Christ, God is represented in the Shekinah and His four main attributes are represented in the mercy seat, the cherubim and the light which shone out of the Shekinah. It will be noticed that v. 89 shows that the Voice of God speaking to Moses came out of the Shekinah—"speaking unto him from above the mercy seat . . . and from between the two cherubim." The things uttered by the Voice also represent wisdom—when God's wisdom expresses itself to our Lord in speech, as true wisdom.

(73) In this piece of symbolism there are weighty truths. Not only does it picture forth the great Jehovah, but also His character. And not only so, but the Voice coming forth from the representation of God, encompassed as it was with the symbols of His four chief attributes, suggests the thought that God's words and acts flow out of, are uttered or done in harmony with, and bring forth fruits in keeping with, His character. It also suggests that our Lord, as Jehovah's Executive, speaks and performs nothing but what is in harmony with Jehovah's character and commands. It also teaches His subordination to Jehovah in all things, more particularly as to getting information, arrangements and works for executing God's Plan. It proves God to be the Source of the Plan, its arrangements and works, as it also proves Jesus to be His Executive. It suggests that neither the Father nor the Son do or say anything contrary to God's character. Our Lord's loyalty in His office work is also implied in the symbol of Moses' always coming loyally to God for direction and performing His will learned in hearing the Voice. As in the type Moses was greatly honored in the prerogative

of his office privileging him to enter the presence of God on every needed occasion; so in the antitype is our Lord highly honored in the pertinent antitypical prerogative. Surely, the Father has highly honored and exalted His Son in this feature of His office, as the Truth Receiver and Dispenser for God's Plan and people. These facts should give us very great confidence in our Lord as God's Executive and Mouthpiece, leading us to the heavenly Canaan. In God's and Moses' conversing together in matters of their personal interests and God's purposes for Israel, etc., what a remarkable type we have of the communion and cooperation of the Father and Son in all their personal interests and in the matter of God's Plan and people!

(74) The foregoing remarks complete our study of Num. 7, the next longest chapter in the Bible. Certainly, the chapter, from the standpoint of its antitypical teachings, is a most remarkable one. And our long-drawn-out study of it should have the effect of enhancing God in our hearts and minds, whose wondrous wisdom foreknew the twelve leading Little Flock movements between the two Harvests and the relations of the crown-lost leaders to these movements and their pertinent teachings. The narrative in v. 89 is a fitting close to this wonderful chapter, since it shows antitypically how our Lord received from the Father the teachings with which the Little Flock leaders started the twelve movements, and how He also received from the Father the pertinent corrective, refutative and ethical teachings which He gave the crown-lost leaders for their Divinely-pleasing service toward the stewardship teachings of those twelve movements. Furthermore, when the antitype of Num. 8: 1-4 is understood, it will be seen that these verses should be in the same chapter with Num. 7: 89; for, from the standpoint of the priestly figure, Num. 8: 1-4 shows how the Scriptural information that God gives our Lord as His Executive in the Most Holy is given to the rest of the

Priesthood. Thus, as seen to be logically connected, Num. 7: 89—8: 4 should be in the same chapter. It is for this reason that we are discussing them together in the same chapter. So far as these verses in themselves are concerned, the antitypical distinction between them is the following: Num. 7: 89 shows how our Lord gets all the information He needs for His office as God's Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for God's people; while Num. 8: 1-4 shows how He gives *as much of this information as is contained in the Bible* to the Priesthood. Some "secret things" that are not revealed in the Bible constitute a part of the information that Jehovah gives our Lord. These He does not make known to the Priesthood. Such "secret things" are for His exclusive guidance, as the Lord assures us in Deut. 29: 29.

(75) Num. 8: 1 tells us of a separate message which, according to the method of revelation outlined in Num. 7: 89, God gave to Moses; and v. 2 tells us the contents of this message. It was a charge as to where Aaron was to stand when he would light the seven lamps of the candlestick. As worded in the A. V., this fact is not recognized. Indeed, the A. V. rendering of vs. 2 and 3 is almost unintelligible and meaningless. The A. R. V. renders these much better: "When thou lightest the lamps, the seven lamps shall give light in *front* of the candlestick, And Aaron did so; he lighted the lamps so as to give light in front of the candlestick." This charge was given in order that Aaron should so stand while lighting the candlestick as not to darken by his shadow the space between the first vail and the candlestick; for this is the space that was in front of the candlestick. Hence in lighting the candlestick Aaron was to stand between it and the second vail, *i.e.*, back of the candlestick. This charge was given typically so that if any under-priest should enter the holy while Aaron was lighting the candlestick, having a clear vision of the space between the first vail

and candlestick, the first thing at which he would look after coming up from under the first vail, would be the candlestick, with no obstructing object between. It was done, also, to indicate that the lampstand got its light from the Most Holy, toward which the high priest stood. Furthermore, it was done so that the high priest should be somewhat in the shadow behind the lampstand, so far as it concerned a priest entering the Holy and standing before the lampstand. It will thus be seen that, not only did the high priest supply all the oil to the lampstand and exclusively trim its wicks and keep the lampstand polished (Lev. 24: 2-4), but, also, he was the only one to light it. All these things are typical.

(76) We will now consider the antitype. We have indicated the main feature of the antitype by the expression used above in this chapter reading as follows: The Gospel-Age Aaron as Truth Giver. Some explanations will make this clear. Our Lord, Himself, explains that the candlestick types the whole Church, seven of them being used to represent the whole Church in its seven epochs (Rev. 1: 20). The under-priests also represent the Church (1 Pet. 2: 5, 9). These two facts puzzle not a few brethren who think that the above two antitypes contradict each other. The following will reconcile the seeming contradiction: The lampstand, giving light to the priest in the holy, types the Church in its capacity of *causing the light to enlighten*—teaching the Truth to—the brethren; while the priest, seeing the light of the lampstand, types the brethren getting enlightenment (getting the Truth) from their Truth-teaching brethren. Thus whenever we teach any of our brethren a Biblical truth, we are in that activity represented in the light-dispensing lampstand; and whenever we are enlightened on any Biblical truth by our brethren, we are in such activity represented in the priest as he saw the light of the lampstand. The wicks in the lampstand represent the humanity of the brethren in their capacity of enlightening

their brethren. The high priest's trimming the wicks represents our Lord ridding us, in our capacity of enlightening one another, from sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, by teaching and disciplining us. As the trimmed wicks gave a brighter and steadier light, so we teach the Truth more clearly and strongly, the more effectively such teaching and disciplining are received by us from our High Priest. This results in our better enlightening one another. This was the first work in the high priest's ordering the lampstand.

(77) The work of filling the candlestick with oil was the second activity that belonged to the ordering of the lampstand, with which duty the high priest alone was charged. As already seen in some detail, oil in this connection represents the spirit of understanding the Truth (Matt. 25: 3, 4, 8-10). This definition implies two things: (1) the Truth and (2) its proper understanding. Both of these our High Priest gives us in our capacity of teaching and understanding the Truth (1 Cor. 1: 30). The carbon parts of the oil would represent the Truth and the parts of the oil containing these carbon parts would represent the spirit of understanding which embraces the Truth. The burning of the carbon parts of the oil caused the light to radiate in the holy. This represents that the service of the Truth is that which causes the Truth to shine forth and give enlightenment. Thus our Lord poured this antitypical oil—the Truth and its understanding—into our hearts and minds; and we, by teaching one another the Truth, hold up to them the light which gives them insight into spiritual things. Under a somewhat different use of this general figure of the lampstand, some differing details are brought out in Zech. 4: 2, 3, 10-13, not so symbolized in Num. 8: 1-4. In both passages the lampstand represents the Church. In Num. 8 our Lord is represented by Aaron, while in Zech. 4 He is represented by the bowl into which the oil flowed and by the two pipes connecting the bowl with the olive

trees, the bowl representing Him as the depositary of the Truth and its understanding for the Church and the two pipes representing Him in His mental powers, through which the Truth is drawn into His mind from the Old and New Testaments, the antitypes of the two olive trees (Rev. 11: 3-12). In both passages the seven branches of the lampstand represent the seven stages of the one Church; and the seven pipes represent the Lord's special mouthpieces to the Church, *i.e.*, the seven angels of the seven churches (Rev. 1: 20). These seven messengers are called (Zech. 4: 10) the Lord's eyes, because the Lord sees for the Church through them. The olive tree to the right of the lampstand represents the New Testament and the one to the left represents the Old Testament. The Zechariah passage shows that our Lord is the depositary of the Church's Truth and its understanding, drawn to Him (the bowl) through His mental powers (the two pipes) from the Old and New Testaments (the two olive trees) and given by Him to the Church through seven composite messengers (seven pipes), one of such for each of the seven stages of the Church. Thus the set of symbols connected with Aaron's ordering the lampstand, so far as the oil is concerned, shows that, under God, our Lord is the depositary and dispenser of the Truth to the Church.

(78) A third thing associated with the ordering of the lampstand was to keep it well polished. This, too, the high priest must have done, as it is implied in such lampstand ordering, which he was commissioned to do. This would represent our Lord by God's Spirit, Word and providences, developing, strengthening, balancing and perfecting the brethren in their capacity of shining the Truth upon one another, and while they are engaged in such activity. Thus as they are engaged in helping one another with understanding the Truth, He so adapts His teachings, Spirit and providences to them as to enable those faithful in such teaching of

their brethren to develop in every good word and work and to become strengthened, balanced and perfected therein (1 Cor. 1: 30; Heb. 13: 20, 21).

(79) Another exclusive function of the high priest was to light the lampstand. This is apparent from Lev. 24: 2-4 and Num. 8: 1-4. This brings us to a special consideration of the antitypes of Num. 8: 1-4. Aaron's lighting the lampstand types our Lord, after He has given us the necessary enlightenment thereto, putting us into circumstances wherein we have opportunities to enlighten our brethren and arousing us by His Spirit, Word and providences to give them such enlightenment. Nobody but the high priest having the right to light the lampstand types the fact that nobody but our Lord is to put himself or others into circumstances wherein they have opportunities to enlighten the brethren, and to arouse them to such activity. This shows the evil of attempting "to set" oneself as a (supposed) enlightener of the brethren and the evil of any one, apart from the Lord's clearly manifested will, attempting "to set" and support another as a (supposed) enlightener of the brethren. It also implies the evil of a private attempt to become or help others to become a (supposed) enlightener of the brethren, apart from the Lord's manifest will, indicating such an activity. The most crying evils of error now so widespread among the Lord's people are in part due to our High Priest's prerogative in this particular having been ignored. The light being made to shine before the lampstand—between it and the first vail—types the facts that all Divinely-approved enlightenment of the brethren comes from the Church and that it is given to those only who humbly, meekly, desirously, honestly and holily dispose themselves to the Church in its capacity of being the Divinely-constituted enlightener of the brethren under Christ. Such an attitude is typed by the priest standing before the lampstand. His first of all seeing the light on coming up from under the

first vail types the fact that the first privilege of the newly-begotten New Creature is to see the Truth. His seeing that it comes from the lampstand types the fact that he recognizes that he gets the Truth from his brethren.

(80) The high priest's not lighting the lamps while standing in front of them types the fact that our Lord's personal visible ministry, without human instrumentality, is not given us in our enlightenment. The shadow that the high priest would have made for a priest coming up to the lampstand, had he stood before it when he lit it, types the fact that for our Lord to teach us visibly, without human instrumentality, would have the effect of bewildering instead of enlightening us. The high priest's standing behind the lampstand when, among other things, in ordering it he lit it, types our Lord's hiding Himself behind His mouthpieces while teaching us, giving us the light, not directly, but through others. His being a spirit being while the pertinent light is being given is typed by the semi-shadow in which the high priest stood, relatively to our approaching priest, while engaged in any part of the ordering of the lampstand. Furthermore, this position was taken by the high priest to type the fact that lighting the lamps came from the direction of the Most Holy-heaven, and thus pointed to God as the final Source of the light which enlightens the Priests. Thus the Gospel-Age Aaron as Truth Giver is set before us from many standpoints in this type.

(81) There is another high-priestly type that represents our High Priest as God's Truth Dispenser to the Church. We refer to the high priest's activity in getting from God responses to Israel's inquiries by the Urim and Thummim. We have in The Present Truth explained that the Urim (*lights*) represent the Scriptural teachings and that the Thummim (*perfections*) represent the four great attributes of God: power wisdom, justice and love. Since we gave that

explanation, the Lord has given us a little further enlightenment on both the type and the antitype. Hitherto it has been an unanswered question as to what were the typical Urim and Thummim. The following are all the passages in which this expression, Urim and Thummim, occurs: Ex. 28: 30; Lev. 8: 8; Num. 27: 21; Deut. 33: 8; 1 Sam. 28: 6; Ezra 2: 63; Neh. 7: 65. It will be noticed that the breastplate .is called such before the 12 precious stones were placed in it, yes, even before the settings for the stones were made in it (Ex. 28: 15-17). It was also called such before the Urim and Thummim were given to it (Ex. 28: 30). They are spoken of as being upon Aaron's heart (Ex. 28: 30), just as the names of the tribes, engraved on the precious stones, and these stones themselves were said to be upon his heart (Ex. 28: 29). Furthermore, as out study of the offerings of the Gospel-Age princes suggests, the twelve stewardship doctrines had connected with them *ethical* teachings which correspond to the twelve stones on which the *names*, typical of teachings and characteristics, of the twelve tribes were inscribed (Ex. 28: 21). The proper translation of the pertinent parts of Ex. 28: 30 and Lev. 8: 8 is as follows: "Thou shalt give to the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim [give it the office of acting as such] " and "He gave the breastplate the Urim and the Thummim [gave it the office of acting as such]." These facts, coupled with the antitypical meaning of Urim (teachings) and Thummim (attributes) seem to identify the Urim and the Thummim with these stones as to their lights (Urim) and as to themselves in their beauties (perfections—Thummim). Hence we are inclined to think that the Urim were the lights that these precious stones radiated when in the light of the most holy and that the Thummim were the precious stones in their beauties brought out perfectly by that same light. Perhaps the answers *yes* were given by the light shining in one direction, and the answers *no* by the light shining

in another direction—up or to the right for *yes*, down or to the left for *no*; but on this the Bible is silent.

(82) While the exact nature of these items is not demonstrable, we do know it to be a fact that our High Priest in answering our queries by the antitypical Urim and Thummim does give His answers by and according to the Bible's teachings and its Divinely prescribed chief graces. Hence the antitype of the Urim and Thummim is clear. The former are the Bible doctrines and the latter are the chief graces. These graces are twelve in number and are the threefold elaboration of the four great attributes of God, which are typed as such by the four right angles of the breastplate and the four-foldedness of the rows in which the typical stones were arranged (Ex. 28: 17) . The typical high priest, therefore, by the harmoniousness of the typical lights radiated from the twelve precious stones and the twelve stones in the breastplate in their beauties was given to understand God's answers to his queries for Israel. This types our Lord getting from God the answers to the queries of spiritual Israel from the harmonious blending of the Bible doctrines and the twelve main graces that the Bible inculcates. Here we have another type of how our Aaron is the Dispenser of God's Truth to us. We should here add that, as we saw in the case of the seven pipes, so with the answers by the antitypical Urim and Thummim, our Lord usually has given His answers through those symbolized by the seven stars. How these facts should exalt Him in our appreciation! How these facts should cure us of the pride that seeks the glory of man as the supposed originators ("original thinkers") of the Truth. Our highest privilege in this connection is to be parts of the lampstand that shines with a borrowed light that Another—our great High Priest—lit. Thus the praise is God's, not ours.

(83) Num. 8: 4 gives a brief description of how the candlestick was built. Its gold represents the

divinity of the Church as New Creatures and light bearers to the brethren. its being of beaten work represents the molding of heart and mind into beautiful and useful qualities and attainments in the light-bearers by the Spirit, Word and providences of God, more particularly by the last in their tribulatory aspects. The expression, "unto the base thereof and unto the flowers thereof," as our Pastor explained, types that the Church as light-bearer to the brethren is throughout beautiful in thought and character and fruitful in good works. This is the way God designed the Church to be made ("according unto the pattern which Jehovah had shown Moses"), since all of us who are of Her "are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained [arranged] that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2: 10). With this reflection we may well close our study of the Gospel-Age Moses and Aaron as Truth Receiver and Giver. Certainly its lessons have been deep, clear, refreshing and upbuilding. Certainly they are calculated to increase our love and reverence for God and Christ, and our appreciation of the great privileges that they give us as Truth receivers and dispensers, and that because God is the Source and Jesus is the Agent of these privileges, as this typical study proves. "Praise God from whom all blessings flow . . . and always in His Son rejoice!"

(1) What was Dan's position in relation to the tabernacle? What was an ancestral peculiarity in the three tribes to the north of the tabernacle? What was it as respects Dan and Naphtali? What figure was presumably on the standard of the camp of Dan? Why? What proves that Dan types the Baptists? What does the word *Dan* mean? Why was it given—type and antitype? How, compared with other denominations, do the Baptists stand related to the Little Flock? How is this typed?

(2) Who was the prince of Dan? What does his name mean? How does this apply antitypically? What conspired to make antitypical Ahiezer one of brotherly helpfulness?

What was the name of Ahiezer's father? What did this name mean? How did it apply antitypically to the crown-lost leaders of the Baptist Church?

(3) Among what people did the pertinent Little Flock movement originate and become sectarianized? Who was its main crown-lost leader? How long did it remain among that people? Who was its first English-speaking leader? Into how many and what parties did its English branch divide? Who were their respective leaders, and who was the reorganizer of one of them? Who was its American organizer? Who was a more recent crown-lost leader of British Baptists?

(4) What two doctrines are not the stewardship doctrines of the Baptist Church? Why are they sometimes so regarded? What feature did the stewardship doctrine have, superior to any in these two doctrines? What was its stewardship doctrine? What do they not think that repentance and faith do? What did they insist was necessary to membership among God's peoples? Against what two doctrines did they protest as related to their stewardship doctrine? In how far were they right? Why? What did their stewardship doctrine really mean? What characteristic did this doctrine have? What does faith-justification really make one? What mistake do Baptists make on it? What was the reason for this mistake? When only could the entire subject be properly seen and fully explained?

(5) What are not the stewardship doctrine of the Baptists? What do they designate as their central—stewardship—doctrine? What definition of conversion did they reject as incomplete? What do they regard as a complete definition? What is in reality its complete definition? What two graces are involved in the Baptist view of conversion? Which is chiefly so? How is this related to the North of the antitypical Tabernacle? Why are they the first denomination in that position? Why are the Presbyterian, Greek Catholic and Lutheran Churches the chief denominations on their respective sides of the antitypical Tabernacle?

(6) Why did the stewardship doctrine of the Baptist Church lead to the emphasis on adult baptism and immersion? Who only should undergo symbolic baptism?

What effect does this have on infant baptism? From what two times was infant baptism denied? What was not at first insisted upon as the exclusive symbol? When and where did this insistence begin? How long after the Baptist sect was organized was this? What two great contributions has the Baptist Church made to Christendom? How so? Who brought the first of these to America? Who started the second? When? What prophecy and sign did this fulfill? What other consideration led to the advocacy of the first of these contributions?

(7) What phenomenon do we find in the Lord's dealings as to the use of servants in starting the twelve Little Flock movements which were later perverted into sects? What are the names of these twelve pairs of Little Flock servants? How did the assisting brothers compare with the twelve leaders?

(8) Who was the Little Flock leader of the movement that was perverted into the Baptist Church? What were his birth and death places and dates? What was he as a scholar, cleric and professor? Where did he function as a cleric? When did he become a Protestant? What did he immediately begin to preach? What city did he shortly visit and what reformer did he temporarily convert to his view? When and why did the latter recede from this position? What did he then become? What were Hubmaier's subsequent activities at Zurich and Waldshut? What did the Austrian government do as to his Waldshut activities? What two things did he then do?

(9) What were his attitude and work as to the German peasants' grievances and their violence? What resulted to them through their disregard of his advice? What did he receive at Easter, 1525, and shortly thereafter administer to others? How did this affect his relations with Zwingli? What did they do to one another? What event happened at Waldshut in December, 1525? What was its effect on Hubmaier? Whither did he flee? What did he there do? Under what influences? What did he do on being fieed? What part did Zwingli have in this affair?

(10) Whither did Hubmaier go in July, 1526? What did he find here and accomplish? What did Moravia and Nikolsburg become to his disciples? Why did they go there? Of what were their persecutors antitypical? What

special work did Hubmaier here do? What was the character of his writings and of himself as a reformer? How was he in comparison and contrast with Luther, Zwingli and Cranmer? What happened to him and his wife in July, 1527, and March, 1528?

(11) What is the character of the persecution that he and his brethren experienced? With what evils, and why, were they blamed? What kind of rulers persecuted them? What are the features of their persecution in Switzerland? Germany? How did they for the most part suffer? How many were martyred in various dependencies of Austria and in Austria itself? What kind of brethren were undoubtedly among these martyrs? What effect did these persecutions have?

(12) What Muenster evils brought the Anabaptists into great disrepute? Where did some of them find a refuge? Who here became their leader? What did he do with them? When did he begin this? What did he do in their defense? What followed thereupon? Describe his subsequent activities. Where else were the Baptists sectarianized? What, as to these, did Rachel's cries for vindication type in this history?

(13) What are not the Baptists' stewardship doctrine? What is it? What is its characteristic? Why? How did they later view this doctrine in relation to immersion? Why did they not see the full Truth on these matters? How do they stand relatively to the other denominations to the Truth on this matter? What advantage did this give their crown-lost leaders?

(14) What did Ahiezer offer? What did his charger represent? From what standpoint? What, more than in their doctrine on it, does conversion imply? What limited the compass of his charger, bowl and spoon? What did his charger correct? How extensive were his corrections? How did they compare as to extension with those of antitypical Abidan's corrections? What does this consideration prompt us to omit in this article? To what will we limit our discussion of antitypical Ahiezer's charger?

(15) What is meant by his offering his charger? What clerical evils flowing out of the doctrine of the Divine right of the clergy did he correct? What kingcraft evils flowing out of the doctrine of the Divine right of kings

did he correct? What evils of officials and aristocrats, flowing out of the doctrine of Divine right of the nobility and capital, did he correct? What was the doctrinal source of these evils? How did these evils affect certain fanatical and unconsecrated hangers-on among the early Anabaptists?

(16) What other classes of evils did he correct? From what standpoint? How did he do this as to pride? Love of human approval? Ease? Life? Contentiousness? Vindictiveness? Hypocrisy? Covetousness? Luxury? The social relations?

(17) What is meant by his offering his bowl? From what two standpoints did he, as well as all other Gospel-Age princes, refute error? Who are meant by the solifidians? Why did antitypical Ahiezer oppose them? What argument did he use against them? With what Scriptures did he make his refutations? What was cogent and what was not cogent in his stand on justification by faith alone? Who paralleled him in a related matter?

(18) How did he refute the argument that all members of state churches were thereby Christians? The argument that infant baptism made one a subject of the Abrahamic Covenant? How did he use against the arguments of the sprinklers and effusionists his viewpoint as to conversion being a death, burial and resurrection, symbolized by immersion? How did he refute the impropriety of using physical force in producing religious belief or recantation? How did he refute the claim that baptism cleansed from original sin and worked faith in infants? How did he refute the entire sacramentarian system of the four sacramentarian denominations? What were the main Scriptures therein used? What should be our judgment as to the outcome of his refutational activity?

(19) What is meant by his offering his spoon? What is implied logically in his stewardship doctrine? How wide was the sphere of his instructions in righteousness? In what ways did he do this? What are the graces to which he exhorted? How are these related to the various forms of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness? How did he necessarily encourage in a negative way to these graces? How did he positively encourage thereto? What

effect did this have, not to be expected from his stand on solifidianism?

(20) From what other standpoint did he also offer his spoon? How was this effected as to tolerance? Religious freedom? The evangelistic spirit? What celebrated author and book show this? How did this encourage foreign missionary work? What must our judgment be as to antitypical Ahiezer's spoon?

(21) The correctness of what two things is shown by the above study? What is evidenced by the persecution of the Baptists and Unitario-Universalists by the other pertinent eight denominations? What does this study further confirm? To what should this move us?

(22) What were Asher's relations? What two meanings has the word *Asher*? How came Leah to give him this name? What does he type? What characteristics did the antitypical mother have and stress? Comparatively how did they stress joy and good fortune? To what degree did they stress these? How did the typical and the antitypical tribe come to its name?

(23) What kind of experiences of certain other sects did they not have? What degree of discomfort only did they have to experience? Why? What did this mean for the leaders? What kind of discomforts came to them? Unlike certain others, what did they wholly lack? Give an illustration showing the opposition of the rabble and its outcome.

(24) Who was the prince of Asher? What does *Pagiel* mean? Why, antitypically, was the name given? What kind of experiences of antitypical Pagiel are narrated widely among Methodists? What would the world call these experiences? What did the pious Methodists call them? Into what extremes, as to God's interventions, did such often go? From whom did they learn these methods? What does the name *Ocran* mean? How does this meaning apply in antitype?

(25) What spirit permeates the Methodist Church? In what has this resulted? What does this imply for its prince? How long did Wesley live and work after beginning his movement? What effect did this have on the activity of Methodism's prince? In what year and by what act did sectarianism in Wesley's movement get an

impetus? Describe that act. How long did Wesley lead his movement? Who are the seven main members of antitypical Pagiel? What were some of the activities of the first three of these? What was the character of the Wesleyan movement before 1784? What followed with it after that year? Despite what circumstance? When did it become a sect? What did Wesley's control of it effect as compared with other Little Flock movements? What do Wesley's concessions imply?

(26) Why is not the stewardship doctrine of the Methodist Church not recognized by many students of it? What similar thing prevails as to Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Baptists? What two doctrines are mistakenly advanced as Methodism's special teaching? Why so? What will enable us to see the mistake of these claims? With what must their stewardship doctrine be connected? How, from this, can we point it out? Why did Wesley stress "conversion" and the feeling of peace and joy?

(27) What is Methodism's stewardship doctrine? How do Methodists distinguish the two activities connected with their three most stressed doctrines? As what did Wesley stress sanctification? What did he usually call it? How was his view misrepresented? In what way was he partly to blame for this misrepresentation? In what publication did he give the most elaborate account of his stewardship doctrine? How did he define Christian Perfection, negatively and positively? What effect did he claim for it? What imperfection in his presentation, in principle present in the pertinent explanations of other similar brethren, do we find in his explanation of his stewardship doctrine? Why was this so? When was the matter properly explained? Why? What was the character of his central thought?

(28) What will enable us to account for his evangelistic work? What made him active toward inconsistent Church members? What resulted therefrom? Why did he and his associates stress teachings related to faith justification? What is the relation of the two doctrines connected with faith justification to the stewardship doctrine? What did this effect in their preaching?

(29) What can be said as to the suitability of these doctrines to the times? What was the 18th century as to

religion? What were its chief international activities? To what revolutions and wars did they lead? What were the leading characteristics of its aristocrats? Of its clergy in England? Of its middle class? What illustrates this? Of the lower class? How did the condition of these classes affect Wesley and his co-laborers? What was the result of these conditions on Wesley and his co-laborers? What were the results of these conditions as to their stewardship doctrine?

(30) Who was the brother who started the Little Flock movement perverted into the Methodist Church? When and where was he born? When and where did he die? Describe his parents. What did they exemplify? Who were their most distinguished sons? Wherein did they excel? What were the chief events of John Wesley's boyhood? Youth? Young manhood? What were the activities of The Holy Club? Who was their leader? What nickname did they receive? Why? What were Wesley's activities from 1729 to 1738?

(31) When, where and what were the circumstances of John Wesley's "conversion"? How does he describe it? What is the historian Lecky's estimate of this event? Who were the human instruments of it? Instead of its being his "conversion," what really was this experience? What did it begin?

(32) What henceforth became his message? Where did he first preach it? What result did it have with the clergy? What did he begin on April 2, 1739? Why did he do this? What were his largest audiences? How far did his voice clearly carry? Describe one of his most historic open-air series of services. What were not, and what were his main qualities as a speaker? How often did he preach? How did he travel and how far yearly? What did he do while riding? Describe his typical town services. How was he in his earlier years as an open-air preacher treated by the rabble?

(33) Describe his first experience with the Walsal mob. His second experience. His experience at Plymouth.

(34) Describe his experiences with mobs at Penfield and Whitechapel. Describe the two defenses of him at Bawden. Within what period were these experiences?

How in number are these related to other similar experiences? What change later set in?

(35) How was his preaching as related to other work? What was his work as a pastor? As a correspondent? As an author? What are his most noted works? On what subjects even did he write? What was his work as an editor? As a publisher? As an educator? As a builder? As a trainer of preachers? As an organizer and overseer of churches? As a conference leader? As an adviser? As a philanthropist? How, among other ways, did he accomplish so much? How numerous were his followers and adherents at his death? Wherein was he at his height of genius? With whom as such has he been favorably compared?

(36) Describe his three chief associates and his colaborers. What did their view of sanctification effect in themselves? In others? What other doctrine constructively and refutatively did their stewardship truth lead them to stress? What are the three parts of that doctrine? With whom did this make controversy? With what result to the few and the many? What was the opinion of King George III on the then four great leaders' efficiency? What does this judgment bespeak?

(37) Describe Wesley's age, his comparative achievements, his physical condition and married life. Why was his married life unhappy? What were some of its main unhappy experiences? What did it work in him? How did it end? How did his step-children stand toward his and his wife's difficulties? How did he take the news of her death? What premarital promise did she make, and then break after their marriage? What did she attempt to do? What did her failure therein effect in her?

(38) What made up for Wesley's marital woes? What was his appearance in age? What qualities contributed to his worthy appearance? How was he in his weakness supported while preaching once in his 87th year? How did this affect his hearers? How did children feel and act toward him? Until when did he continue to preach? When and to whom and why did he write his last letter? Describe his death-bed experience.

(39) What should we expect of antitypical Pagiel? Why? Of what does antitypical Pagiel's charger consist?

Along what three lines did it especially move? Why is correction of sin included in his charger? What did such correction effect in the early Methodists? What worldly amusements came under his corrections? What did he do when his corrections were disregarded? What second group of offenses did he correct? What third group of offenses did he correct? What fourth group? What fifth group? What sixth group? Why did he inveigh against these six forms of worldliness?

(40) Toward what other line of evil against his stewardship truth did antitypical Pagiel inveigh? What was the first expression of this evil to meet his rebukes? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? What other line of evils did he also rebuke? Why are not details thereon here given? What did antitypical Pagiel especially effect by his corrections?'

(41) What was antitypical Pagiel's bowl? Wherein was he weak in connection with his stewardship truth? Why so? Wherein was he strong? What ten lines of distinction did he present to refute the fusing of justification and sanctification? What did they enable him to do? In what seven ways did he refute the teaching that disinterested love is not the heart of sanctification?

(42) What was antitypical Pagiel's spoon? How did it compare with other antitypical spoons? To whom did he. exhort that love be given? What things did he show regarding it? Through what things did he encourage to its practice? For what did he commend it to his hearers? In doing these things what did he accomplish? How should his spoon affect us?

(43) Who was Naphtali? What does the name mean?, Why was it given? Whom does Naphtali represent? What name had better be given these? Why? How thus would the Universalists be regarded? What have Unitarians succeeded in doing with ministers and laymen of other churches? Why does the name *Naphtali* fit as a typical name for them? Why are they not a child of antitypical Rachel? Why are they represented as a child of antitypical Bilhah? To what extent are they set at naught by the so-called orthodox?

(44) Who was Naphtali's prince? From what words was this name compounded? What do they mean? What

does the word *Ahira* mean? How does this name typically designate the crown-lost leaders of the Unitarians? What three teachings do they deny? How does this affect the opinion and attitude of their opponents toward them? How do antitypical Rachel's children view them? What true teachings have some Unitarian leaders denied? What is their view of the atonement, negatively and positively? How does the Truth treat the two views of atonement that the Unitarians and the "orthodox" oppose to one another? What does this situation reveal of the average man? What does the word *Enan* mean? What does its meaning typify in the Unitarian leaders?

(45) Who first sectarianized a Little Flock movement into Unitarianism? How were Laelius and Faustus Socinus related in flesh and in spirit? Whose co-laborer was Laelius Socinus? What like thing did the two Socini do? To what two countries did Faustus go? What did he do in the second of these two countries? Describe the history of Polish Unitarianism. Hungarian Unitarianism. Its chief leader. English Unitarianism. Who was the chief English Unitarian? Who were the chief three American Unitarians? Briefly describe each of these.

(46) What does the name *Naphtali* imply of these leaders? What were the character and effects of Socinus' writings? What is the character of Norton's Statement of Reason? Abbott's exegesis of pertinent Greek Scriptures? What was their manner in controversy? How did they in this contrast with their usual opponents? What effect had this? How did Archbishop Tillotson characterize the spirit of their debating? The manner of their debating? The words of their debating? How does he compare them with other controversialists? What did they have and lack, according to the archbishop?

(47) What kinship of spirit have the majority of the Unitarian leaders had? What do many of them deny as to our Lord's pre-existence? As to the virgin birth? As to the ransom? As to Scriptural inspiration? How do they regard the Scriptures? To what do they subordinate the Scriptures? What is their attitude on total depravity? To what extreme has this led them? What do these stands make of them now? What has their stressing God's love led them to teach? What effects has this wrought in

them? What has hindered their taking a more prominent part in many general humanitarian movements?

(48) How can the stewardship doctrine of the Unitarians be located? To what is it related? In what two ways may it be stated? Which is the preferable of these? Why? What do they deny of Jesus? Of the Holy Spirit? What, according to them, is God, and His supreme attribute? What does their stressing this attribute prove of their place about the antitypical Tabernacle? What teaching have some of them held through a one-sided emphasis on this quality? How do they reason from this attribute as to eternal torment? What has emphasis on this attribute of God moved them to do with the doctrine of the soul's immortality? What do they teach as to a future probation and its outcome for the impenitent?

(49) Against what three errors is this stewardship doctrine, a protest? When did these errors arise? Who introduced the doctrines of the soul's immortality and eternal torment among Christians? How did he come to do this? To what other error did he give a faint start? How? What evils and good did his apologies effect? Why should Unitarians fight these three errors? Why are we right in calling these three errors the fundamental errors of the nominal church? What is the fundamental doctrine of the Truth?

(50) Who begat antitypical Naphtali? When and where was he born? When and where did he die? What were the chief facts in his life until 1530? What were his experiences during 1530? What was the name and date of his first publication? What did it begin? What was his age at its publication? What is a proper estimate of this book? How were he and it regarded by Melanchthon and by Quintana? What did he do with it in 1532? What did writing against the trinity then involve? In consequence, what did Servetus have to do?

(51) Where did he turn up in 1535? Under what name? How long did he continue with this name? What did he do at Lyons? What did he find there? What did this association lead him to do? Where did he go to study medicine? Whom did he meet there? Why was Calvin there? What did Calvin seek to do with Servetus? What was arranged between them? Why did Servetus fail to

appear? Into what relation did he enter with his chief teacher? What was the latter's estimate of him? What were his activities until 1538? Where did he then go? Why? What did he do at Avignon and at Charlieu? What did he do in Sept., 1540?

(52) Who was one of his students? To what did this lead in 1541? How long did he continue there as such? What else did he there do? What was he to outward appearance? What did he do privately? What was his view and practice as to baptism? What things did he do with Calvin? What did Calvin do as to his suggestion of a visit to Geneva? How did Calvin reply to him and express himself to others on Servetus? What was given to Servetus as to Calvin's attitude? Of what did he complain? What happened with his efforts to secure publishers for his book, The Restoration Of True Christianity? Why was this? Where did he finally get a printer? How was it printed and sent away? What mistake did Servetus make? What did Calvin do about this? What did the inquisitor-general then do? What did Servetus then do? Why? Where and how did he spend the next four months?

(53) When did Servetus enter Geneva? With what purpose? How was it frustrated? What then occurred? With what was he charged? What three great injustices did he suffer in being tried? Who first appeared as his prosecutor? Who then did this? How long did the trial last? Of what did it largely consist? Wherein was Servetus, and wherein was Calvin victorious in the debate? What must we deplore in Calvin? What relative number of the judges sided with Servetus? Who also pronounced Servetus a heretic? What sentence did they expect? What was Calvin's plan? What sentence was pronounced? What three things should have prevented the entire action, beginning with Servetus' arrest? What change in the sentence did Calvin half-heartedly seek to secure?

(54) What is the date of Servetus' burning? Why was Farel introduced into the final scenes? With what effect on Servetus and on himself? What did the judges do on Oct. 27th? Where was Servetus then taken? What was done on arrival at the place of execution? What kind of

fagots were used? How were they placed? In what did this result? What mockery was indulged in? How was his burning begun? What did its first pains produce? How did he thereafter suffer? What were his last words? What did they imply?

(55) Of what was Servetus' encounter with Calvin and his churches the antitype? What two evils were manifested in the antitype? What two motives animated Calvin? What do they prove in him personally and as a representative of his church? What injury to Calvin's character is revealed by the deference shown him? What did Servetus not show him? Why did the Lord not desire it? What palliates Calvin's conduct? What must be held against him? How did his theory and practice on persecution agree? How did his inconsistency affect his character and reputation? How should we feel on this?

(56) From what and to what should we proceed? What was antitypical Ahira's charger? What do all Trinitarians do? What did his charger do to this? What did he designate this? What practice of trinitarianism did he correct? What did he do with Mariolatry? Why? What insult to the Father did he correct? Who purposed this insult? What hocus-pocus did he correct in trinitarianism? What other evil does teaching trinitarianism involve? What did he do with this? What third evil does teaching trinitarianism involve? What did he do with this? For teaching what two other errors did he correct them? With what did he charge them for such teachings? Worse than whom did they represent God thereby? What is a summary of antitypical Ahira's charger on trinitarianism?

(57) What else did antitypical Ahira correct? What is God's disinterested love? In what is this love involved? What kind of conduct, accordingly, does his charger correct? What three lines of conduct did he correct? With whom in common did he correct in these three respects? What did he thereby show? Why do we not here study the details of these three forms of corrections? What is necessary to point out here?

(58) What else did antitypical Ahira offer? What did he show the doctrine of the trinity and of the God-man to be? What did he further show of them, negatively and positively? What did he disprove of Jesus? How do the

passages that the "orthodox" use to prove Jesus' deity disprove it? How do Jesus' statements disprove it? How does the tenor of the Bible disprove it? How does its source disprove it? How is the argument for His deity based on prayer offered to Him disproved? How is the argument based on His pre-existence disproved? How is the argument based on His powers, authority, attributes and works disproved? What did antitypical Ahira do in answer to arguments that the "orthodox" base on various Scripture passages as allegedly proving the trinity? In what four ways did he meet these arguments? What will not be necessary to set forth here?

(59) What else did antitypical Ahira offer? What is it? To what did his stewardship doctrine naturally lend itself? Why? What did it enable him to do? Of what did God's love to saint and sinner become? What will this also explain? Why are details not here given?

(60) How many sections does Num. 7 contain? How may the offerings of the princes be grouped? What verses are to be studied as the final section on the princes? What does Num. 7: 84-88 give? Of what would a summary of them consist? What is a preferable rendering of v. 84? What is the altar of v. 84? What is its antitype? What is the antitype of its anointing? What is typed by the anointing of the altar before the princes offered? What illustration shows this? How did this matter stand with the Little Flock members in the other eleven movements?

(61) How will the summary of the twelve offerings be given in this study? What is the summary as to the first offering? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? The eighth? The ninth? The tenth? The eleventh? The twelfth?

(62) What special points did the preceding paragraph bring to our mind? Relatively how many Little Flock members partook in each movement? Relatively how many crown-losers partook in each sectarianizing work? Who were the antitypical altar? What was the condition on which they received their anointing? What do the twelve sets of dedication gifts type in their three kinds? What did they constitute in their three cases?

(63) Of what materials were the chargers, bowls and

spoons of all the princes made? What do silver and gold symbolize? What does this imply as to the antitypical chargers, bowls and spoons? What does this imply as to the antitypical princes' chargers, bowls and spoons? What was the weight of each charger, bowl and spoon? What is the total of the weight of each charger, bowl and spoon? What thoughts are typed by the weight of each vessel and the three vessels? Why? What is typed by the fact that their total weight is a multiple of both seven and ten? What is typed by the weight of each vessel? What is the antitype of the contrast between the silver and the gold vessels?

(64) What does v. 85 give as to weights? What are they? What is the total of its weights? What is typed by their total? What do they indicate in all the crown-losers? How is this symbolized? How does this contrast with the Little Flock's sacrifice? How is this indicated? What does the expression, shekel *of the sanctuary*, imply?

(65) What new thought is given in v. 86? What is typed in the *ten* shekels' weight? What are two things typed by the 120 shekels' weight? How so? What was the weight of all the vessels? What does this seem to suggest? What seems to be implied by this? In view of this, how should an answer in P '26, 173, be understood, and how not understood? How in this connection is the unity of the crown-retainers set forth? How the disunity of the crown-losers?

(66) What do verses 15-17 show? In how many forms were the animal sacrifices brought? What do the burnt-offerings type? The sin-offerings? The peace-offerings? What do the bullock, the ram and the lamb type in the burnt-offering? The kid of the goats in the sin-offering? The oxen, the rams, the he goats and the lambs in the peace-offering? What is typed by the lamb in the burnt-offering and in the peace-offering being one year old? What seven things prove that the crown-lost leaders of the twelve denominations are typed by the twelve princes? How do they prove this?

(67) What is not, and what is typed by the twelve-foldedness or the multiple of twelve-foldedness as including the number 6 in the types of Christ's sacrifice in this connection? What is not, and what is typed by the twelve-foldedness

or multiples of twelve-foldedness as including the number 6 in the types of the Church and its sacrifice in this connection? What is emphasized in the last sentence of v. 88? What does this type?

(68) What is the main character of our present study? What does it mainly serve? What should it effect in its student? How should we regard Num. 7? . Of what is it another evidence? What gives this evidence added emphasis? To what should it lead us?

(69) What records are placed between the accounts of the princes' offerings and the Levites' consecration? Of what does Num. 7: 89 treat? Wherein did God's manner of giving revelations to Moses differ from that of those given to the high priests and prophets? What did this imply that God and Moses did to one another? What occurred in their conversations? What character has Num. 7: 89? Among other things, in what way did Moses type Christ? How did he type Him in Num. 7: 89?

(70) What does Moses in the most holy type? What does his seeking information there type? What is our Lord's relation to His teachings and works? What is typed by Moses' having access to the most holy for every need in his office? What is typed by God's always answering Moses? What is typed by Moses' always giving the needed responses as due? What kind of other information did Moses sometimes get? What did this type? What kind of things of Christ's acts will be made fully known to the Faithful of the Epiphany? What does this account teach as to the Source of all our Lord's acts and teachings?

(71) Whence came the Voice that spoke to Moses? What does the mercy seat type? What two things prove this? What do the two cherubim type? What two things prove this? What does the word *glory*, as applied to God, signify? What Scriptures prove this? How do they give this proof? How can we prove from Scripture that this word means a character like God's in us? What conclusion flows from these thoughts as to the meaning of the expression, cherubim of *glory*? What seals this proof?

(72) What were the four things above the chest of the ark? What was the Shekinah? Where is the word not found? What does it mean? What was its relation to

God? How do the Scriptures prove this? What has it been mistakenly taken to represent? What proves that it represents God? In what sense was it not God? In what sense was it God? What case is somewhat parallel to this? How is wisdom represented in connection with the top of the ark? How are God and His main attributes represented above the chest of the ark? What does that chest type? Out of what did the Voice come? How is this proved? What else types wisdom?

(73) What is the character of the symbolism of Num. 7: 89? What are the chief three things thereby represented as to God? What two things as to our Lord does it type? What does it type as to their relations to the Plan, its arrangements and works? What does it deny of the Father and the Son? What quality in our Lord does it suggest? What degree of honor for Him does it suggest? What effects in us should these considerations produce? What is the chief thought of this study?

(74) What is the antitypical character of Num. 7? What should its study effect in us? For what facts? How should we characterize v. 89? Why? How are Num. 7: 89 and 8: 1-4 related? A part of what should they form? What is the antitypical distinction between them? How is the distinction between the secret and the revealed things brought out in them?

(75) What does Num. 8: 1 imply? What charge was given Aaron in v. 2? Where is this obscure? And where clear? How does the clear rendering read? Why, firstly, was this charge given? What space was in front of the candlestick? Why, secondly, was Aaron to stand behind the lampstand when "ordering it"? Why thirdly? Why fourthly? Why fifthly? What four things in the ordering of the lampstand were exclusively Aaron's charge? What is the character of all these things?

(76) Wherein is the main antitype of Num. 8: 1-3 given What does the candlestick type? How is this proved? Whom does the under-priest type? What distinction harmonizes the seeming contradiction between these two antitypes? What example clarifies this? What do the wicks represent? What is represented by the high priest's trimming the wicks? What is typed by the brighter and

steadier light of the trimmed lamps? What results in the antitype?

(77) What was the second high-priestly activity in ordering the lampstand? What does the oil in this type represent? How is this proved? What two things does this imply? What is our High Priest's relation to them? What do the carbon and non-carbon parts of the oil represent? What does the burning of the carbon parts of the oil type? What is the process in the antitype? What are the distinctions in the view-points of Num. 8: 1-4 and Zech. 4: 2, 3, 10-13? What do the two olive trees represent? What are some of the similarities in these passages? What is the distinction between the seven pipes and the seven eyes? What is represented by the olive tree to the right? To the left? What is a brief summary of the antitype of the Zech. passage? Of the Num. passage?

(78) What was the third feature in ordering the lampstand? Whose exclusive function was this? What four activities of our Lord toward the light-bearers does this type? How does He accomplish them? In connection with what does He do these things?

(79) What was the fourth exclusive high-priestly function toward the lampstand? What proves this? What is typed by Aaron's lighting the lampstand? What is typed by this as an exclusive high-priestly function? What two evils does this condemn? What has resulted from its disregard? What two things are typed by the light being made to shine before the lampstand? How does the priest type the second of these things? What is typed by the priest's first sight in the Holy? What is typed by his seeing the light coming from the lampstand?

(80) What is typed by the high priest's not lighting the lampstand from its front? What would have been typed by his shadow, had he stood there? What is typed by his standing behind it when lighting the lampstand? What does his being relatively in the semi-shadow type? What further was typed by this position?

(81) What other high-priestly type is related to our subject? What do the Urim and Thummim type? What question has hitherto been unanswered? What Scriptures refer to them? What considerations seem to associate

them with the precious stones in the breastplate and their lights? What seemingly were they? How were the answers *yes* and *no* perhaps given?

(82) While their identity is not demonstrable, what is demonstrable of their antitypes? How do we prove the nature of their antitypes? What are they? How many graces answer to the Thummim? How are they related to God's four great attributes? How is this typed? How did the typical high priest recognize God's response by the Urim and Thummim? What does this type? What does this type reveal? Through whom does our Lord usually give God's answers to our inquiries? What three effects should these considerations work in us?

(83) What does v. 4 give? What does the candlestick's gold type? Its being beaten work? The expression, "Unto the base thereof and unto the flowers"? For what did God create the Church as the antitypical lampstand? What is the character of this study? What are its intended effects? Why? To what should this lead us?

In the wondrous breastplate golden,
Safely on His bosom holden,
  See the jewels from the mine!
Amethyst and onyx wearing
Mystic marks, and each one bearing
  Traces of the hand Divine.
Sapphires 'mid the gorgeous cluster
Sparkle with celestial luster,
  Like the crystal dome above;
Ruby rare and topaz blending
In that glory never-ending,
  Safe upon the breast of love.

Emerald and beryl throwing
Chastened hues, the fairer growing,
  As the jasper blends the rays;
Chrysoprase, like king's attire,
Glowing like a star of fire,
  Or a soul that loves to praise.
Who the love and pain can measure,
Ere revealed this hidden treasure,
  One by one in dazzling light?
On His breast our High Priest wears them,
On His shoulder, see, He bears them,
  Ever in our Father's sight.

CHAPTER VIII.

CLEANSING, CONSECRATION AND SERVICE OF GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. Num. 8: 5-26.

THE CLEANSING OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITIES. THE CONSECRATION OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. THE FACTS OF THE CLEANSING AND CONSECRATION OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. THE SERVICE OF THE GOSPEL-AGE LEVITES. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IT IS AN undeniable fact that during the Gospel-Age there have been three classes among God's professed people: (1) the consecrated, (2) the justified and (3) the sinners, corresponding respectively to the holy, the court and the camp, or to the Priests, the Levites and the Israelites (of the twelve non-sacred tribes). The fact that God's people of these three classes were in the Jewish Age fleshly Israel implies that spiritual Israel as the antitype of fleshly Israel would consist of three classes—those mentioned above (Is. 8: 14; Gal. 6: 15; Matt. 21: 43; Luke 13: 33; Phil. 3: 3; 1 Cor. 10: 18). We have shown various phases of these three parts of God's two Israels, especially in this book. In this chapter we will study, type and antitype, the cleansing and consecration of the Gospel-Age Levites, as this is typically set forth in Num. 8: 5-26. And may the Lord bless to all of our dear readers this study as a part of the advancing Epiphany Truth, which to understand is one of the privileges of the Epiphany-enlightened saints.

(2) Toward the end of the preceding chapter we set forth the Gospel-Age Moses and Aaron as Truth Receiver and Giver, as typed in Num. 7: 89—8: 4. That study brought us up to the present study. Let us remember that we are not in this chapter studying the cleansing and consecration of the Epiphany and Millennial Levites; for as to the former we have not yet proceeded through their cleansing and as to the latter

we have not yet even come to their cleansing; hence we do not understand either sufficiently to set them forth aright, which proves that they are not yet due to be understood sufficiently to make them satisfactorily clear. Accordingly, as not due, we shelve their consideration for the present and limit in this study our attention to the Gospel-Age antitype of Num. 8: 5-26; for it is now evidently due, as the following discussion, we trust, will factually prove. This discussion, we trust, will satisfy all of us as to the truthfulness of our Pastor's thought on the faith-justified of the Gospel-Age as being the Gospel-Age Levites—the viewpoint set forth by him in Tabernacle Shadows—the other viewpoints being set forth in others of his writings, all of which we believe to be correct.

(3) In former chapters of this book the factual and typical proof was given that the faith-justified have been the Gospel-Age Levites. As such, of course, they are only tentative Levites. The Levites of the finished Gospel-Age picture are those of the Epiphany—the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. But the facts of the case abundantly prove the faith-justified to be the (tentative) Gospel-Age Levites. In our study we will first direct our attention to their cleansing and then to their consecration. The cleansing as a thing commanded is set forth from v. 6 to the middle of v. 10 and in v. 12; and their consecration as a thing commanded is set forth in the second half of v. 10, in v. 11 and from vs. 13 to 19, and the fact of their cleansing and consecration, with their service thereafter, is set forth from v. 20 to v. 26. A careful study of these vs. will show a most remarkable correspondence between the cleansing and consecration of the typical Levites and the cleansing and consecration of their Gospel-Age antitypes. V. 5 shows us that the whole procedure with the Levites, as set forth in the rest of the chapter originated in God. It was not Moses nor Aaron nor any other human who originated this service. God was

its sole Originator. And this evidently is true, because this chapter, like the others of Numbers so far studied, is typical and therefore prophetical; hence it was a matter of inspiration, which proves it to have originated in God as a part of His inspired revelation, for v. 5 reads, *"The Lord spake* unto Moses, *saying."*

(4) V. 6 contains two charges given by God to Moses: (1) to sever the non-priestly descendants of Levi from the rest of Israel and (2) to cleanse them. In this type God, of course, represents Himself in His Gospel-Age activity toward those who are to become antitypical Levites, charging that they be distinguished from the antitypical Camp and be cleansed as such. In this transaction Moses, as usually in the book of Numbers, represents our Lord Jesus as Jehovah's Gospel-Age Executive for the matter at hand. Our Lord severed the prospective faith-justified from the rest of the antitypical Camp by a series of providences that frequently implied prenatal influences, giving them a responsive heredity for antitypical Leviteship, that sometimes implied more or less of untoward experiences with the sinners in the antitypical Camp, that always implied more or less suffering that was calculated to impress them with the unsatisfactoriness of sin and with a hunger for righteousness, and that often made on them a favorable impression toward God and righteousness, all four sets of these experiences being more or less accompanied by another set—experiences with certain religious teachings adapted to the antitypical Camp—those seeking more or less relations with God, but not advancing from the Camp condition of sinners to the condition of repentance typed by the open space between the camp and the tabernacle. It was by these five sets of experiences—four providential and one educational—that our Lord, as distinct from their cleansing and consecration, severed the prospective faith-justified from other sinners. In the widest sense, not only these five sets of experiences,

but also their cleansing and consecrating may be spoken of as a severing of them from the antitypical Israelites. But in v. 6 the words, "take the Levites from among the children of Israel," refers exclusively to the five sets of separating experiences given above.

(5) The word, *cleansing*, in reference to the Gospel-Age, is used in the Bible in a narrow and in a wide sense. In the wide sense it refers to one's being washed (1) from the *condemnation* of sin, which occurs through the blood of Christ, and (2) from the *power* of sin, which occurs through the Word backed by the providences of God. But in vs. 6 and 7 the word *cleanse* is not used in the wide, but in a narrow sense—cleansing from the *power* of sin—as is evident from v. 7, while the other narrow sense of the cleansing is set forth under the atonement figure in v. 12. In v. 21 both of the narrow senses are combined, *i.e.*, the word is used in its wide sense—"to cleanse them." In v. 7 we are directly told that the processes whereby the typical Levites were cleansed were to type the first of the above-mentioned two narrow senses—cleansing from the *power* of sin—"Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them." Looking at these processes as they are set forth in the pertinent part of v. 7, we find that they are three in number: (1) sprinkling waters of purifying on the Levites, (2) the shaving of all their flesh and (3) washing their clothes. These three things severally done to or by the Levites in the type completed the cleansing part of the service in the first narrow sense of that word. These were the types and a consideration of their antitypes brings some very remarkable things to our knowledge. We now proceed to such a consideration.

(6) First, then, we will study the antitype of the sprinkling of the water of purifying upon the Levites. The waters of purifying of v. 7 are the same as the waters of separation in Num. 19: 9, 17. In the Hebrew of v. 7 the expression is, waters of *chatath*. The Hebrew

word *chatath* primarily means *sin*, secondly, *sin-offering* (v. 8), just as the Greek word *hamartia* also has these two meanings, which we have elsewhere shown, and, thirdly, *sin purification* (Num. 19: 9, 17). It also means *punishment for sin* (Zech. 14: 19) and *condition of sin*, *i.e.*, guilt of sin (Gen. 18: 20; Num. 16: 26; 32: 23; Ezek. 18: 24). Of these five meanings we are here concerned with the third only, as the one in which v. 7 uses the word. The antitype of the waters of purifying our Pastor has given us in Tabernacle Shadows, when explaining the waters in which the ashes of the red heifer were mingled, *i.e.*, truths gathered from the record of the Ancient Worthies' suffering for righteousness as helpful in cleansing from the powers of Adamic sin, partially in the Gospel-Age and more particularly in the Millennial Age. In Num. 19: 11-22 the typical waters of purification are set forth as used to cleanse from the defilement incidental to being in the presence of, or touching the dead. The dead here represent Adam and his race under the death sentence in sin. To be in the presence of the dead types one's having the hereditary defilement of the Adamic sin, and to touch the dead types one's actively practicing Adamic sins as a result of inheriting its depravity. The ashes of the red heifer themselves represent the memories—histories—of the Ancient Worthies as these are contained in the Old Testament. The living [running] waters (Num. 19: 17) represent the progressive truths in the antitypes. *E.g.*, the history [memory, *i.e.*, that which is now left of these acts of the two prophets] of the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha is some of the antitypical ashes, while the true antitypical teachings of this history are some of the antitypical living waters; the true setting forth of the type and antitype is the antitype of the mingling of some of the ashes and water; and the vessel that contained the waters of purifying represents in the case under consideration the doctrine of

mouthpieceship toward the public in relation to the Little Flock and Great Company. These same general principles apply to the other types and antitypes. Such teachings cleanse from sin's power, not from sin's condemnation (which Christ's blood alone does), antitypical of the waters of purifying cleansing from the defilement incurred by contact with the dead those in Israel who used it.

(7) These considerations prepare us to see the antitype of the sprinkling of the waters of purification upon the Levites as the first step in their cleansing. We, accordingly, understand the charge of God to Moses to sprinkle the waters of purifying upon the Levites to represent God's charging our Lord to see to it that truths connected with the histories of the Ancient Worthies should be taught to the prospective faith-justified. These truths would be of two kinds: those in the types (ashes) and those in the antitypes (running water). The types themselves, as a rule, contain three kinds of truths: (1) historical (the stories, memories, as such, of the Ancient Worthies); (2) ethical (the lessons for imitation contained in the types); and (3) correctional (frequently these stories contain warnings against sin, *e.g.*, the story of Joseph's brethren, of David and Bathsheba, etc). And, of course, the antitypes as progressive truths have these same three lines of teachings. Thus both the types and the antitypes would serve to cleanse from the power of sin in the antitypical sprinkling—teaching. And certainly our Lord throughout the Gospel-Age, in obedience to the Father's antitypical charge, has seen to it that historical, ethical and correctional truths connected with some types and antitypes of the Ancient Worthies were taught those who were being worked upon to influence them toward justification.

(8) To this end the stories of the fall, Cain and Abel, the flood, the tower of Babel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, his brethren, Moses, Pharaoh, the

Judges, Saul, David, Solomon, the other kings of Israel, the prophets, etc., and as much of their antitypes as were known, from time to time were told these, *e.g.*, Ishmael and Isaac as types of Jews and Christians, Joseph as a type of Christ, Israel's battles with the inhabitants of Canaan as types of Christians' battles with sin and error, the journey to Canaan as a type of the Lord's people journeying to the kingdom, etc., etc., etc. To the prospective faith-justified these teachings were given at home, in school, in catechetical classes, Sunday schools, sermons, conversations, papers, magazines and books. The Lord, therefore, used as His agents to sprinkle the antitypical waters of purifying on these parents, teachers, catechists, preachers, writers, etc. And certainly as a result considerable historical, ethical and correctional teachings, type and antitype, were given to them; and these served as a good standard whereby faults could be seen and corrected, virtues could be seen and practiced and truths could be seen and believed. All of this, of course, served to help the prospective Levites to cleanse themselves, as they helped them to hate and put away sin and practice righteousness. This, of course, helped them to perform the antitypical cleansing from the contamination of inherited and practiced Adamic sin. Accordingly, we see that the sprinkling of the antitypical waters of purification on the prospective Gospel-Age Levites helped them to, and on the way of repentance; because it gave them a knowledge of sin and righteousness and stirred up in them a partial hatred of, and partial desire to be free from sin's contamination, and a partial love for, and desire to practice righteousness, all of which constitute a part of repentance, the first step of an approach toward God.

(9) The second process for cleansing the Levites is set forth in the following language of v. 7: "let them shave all their flesh," literally, as in the margin, "let them cause a razor to pass over all their flesh." We

understand this razor to represent the sharp exposures of the Law. The expression *law* as involved in the antitypical razor implies two things: (1) God's justice, righteousness (Deut. 4: 13; Ex. 34: 28; Rom. 2: 14, 15, 27; 7: 7-14); and (2) a contract between God and man in which God offered life to the obedient and required death of the disobedient (Deut. 30: 15-20; Hos. 6: 7; see R. V.; Gal. 2: 16; 3: 10-12). Its two forms so far are the natural Law and the Mosaic Law. In the Millennium it will take on a third form, the New Law or Covenant. The Scriptures teach us that the Law teaches the responsive, first, the knowledge of their sins (Rom. 3: 20). This it does, first by showing what is right in motive, thought, word and deed, and what is wrong in motive, thought, word and deed, and, secondly, by showing each one that he has failed repeatedly to do right in motive, thought, word and deed, and has repeatedly done wrong in motive, thought, word and deed, thus convincing him of being guilty of sins of omission and commission (Rom. 3: 19). The first of these two functions of the Law it performs by setting forth general principles as to thoughts, motives, words and acts, *e.g.*, its statement of the ten commandments (Ex. 20: 1-17) and various explanations of them (Matt. 23: 27-40; Rom. 7: 1-25) and its detailing of various thoughts, motives, words and acts in harmony with, and contrary to these. The second of these two functions it performs by applying this knowledge to the thoughts, motives, words and acts of those whose attention it attracts by its teachings and accusations. Thus it educates such as to a knowledge of righteousness and sin in general and of their own in particular; and by proving them guilty of sins of omission and commission, in motive, thought, word and deed, it convinces them that they are sinners (Rom. 7: 1-25). Not only does the revealed Law of God do these things, but also the natural Law, remnants of which are written in men's minds and hearts,

with the co-witnessing of conscience works such knowledge and conviction (Rom. 2: 14, 15). By these offices of the Law it convinces the honest-hearted that they are weak, fallen and faultful, and thus cannot please God and thus are completely unable to justify themselves (Rom. 3: 10-20; Gal. 2: 16).

(10) But the Law does more than exposing men's sins; it brings upon them God's condemnation with its outworking in the various features of the curse (Rom. 4: 15; Gal. 3: 10). At the same time, it convinces the responsive that they are under God's condemnation and are undergoing its effects (Rom. 7: 1-24). This arouses in their hearts fear toward God, whom they recognize as being displeased with them (Rom. 1: 18). At the same time it also arouses sorrow for, and hatred of sin in their hearts and a hearty desire to be free from its condemnation and power (Rom. 7: 15-24; 2 Cor. 7: 9, 10). By the influence of such knowledge, conviction, sorrow, hatred and desire for deliverance, the Law further works the conviction of man's inability to merit deliverance from the condemnation of the Law (Rom. 3: 20; Gal. 2: 16) and his lack of strength to deliver himself from the power and dominion of sin (Rom. 7: 14, 18, 23). This results in his utter despair of himself to save himself from the condemnation of the Law, and stirs up in him the most earnest desire to gain deliverance from its condemnation and from the power of sin. Here the Law stops; for it can go no further than to show man his lost and undone condition and make him desire a Savior outside of himself; but it cannot give him that Savior, whom to give is the function, not of the Law, but of the Gospel (Gal. 3: 24). Thus far the symbolic razor—the Law's exposures—worked, but could do no more.

(11) Let us now look at antitypical Moses' part in the use of this antitypical razor. He, of course, did not use it personally, nor did he personally hand it to the prospective antitypical Levites. For this he used

agents, some of them being animate and others being inanimate, the latter, however, being prepared by some of the former. These animate agents were sometimes officials among the priests—apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, *i.e.*, teachers, and deacons—and sometimes priestly brethren who had no office in the real Church. Sometimes these animate agents were antitypical Levites, especially antitypical Gershonite Levites, and that of the Libni branch, acting as evangelists, revivalists, pastors, catechists, local preachers, Sunday school teachers, parents, older brethren and other "lay workers." The inanimate agents usually were books, like the Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, catechisms, pertinent hymns, tracts, magazines, etc., treating on subjects connected with the Law and repentance. Broadly speaking, these Levites belonged to two sets of denominations—the ritualistic and non-ritualistic. Among the former have been the Greek and Roman Catholic, the Lutheran and the Episcopal churches. Among the latter have been the Calvinistic, Baptist, Unitarian, Congregational, Quaker, Methodist, Christian and Adventist churches. The former, as a rule, used the catechetical method of handling the symbolic razor to the prospective faith-justified, and the latter, as a rule, used the revival or evangelistic method for that purpose, though the Calvinistic church has used both of these methods. It is, of course, not our thought that all who underwent catechetical instruction accepted this razor and used it for its intended purpose; nor that all who attended revival and evangelistic services did this. But undoubtedly those who were rightly disposed by these two methods of handling the antitypical razor—the Law's exposures—to them, did make a proper use of it. In some cases such received this razor in the more private ways of conversation and reading.

(12) This brings up the interesting question: How did these animate and inanimate agencies hand this

razor to the prospective antitypical Levites? By teaching, preaching and describing to them the Law. This means that they explained to them the nature, the principles, the demands, the promised rewards and the threatened punishments of the Law. Thereby they acquainted them with the Law and their relations to it. They did this in such a way as revealed to them a picture of themselves reflected by the Law as a figurative mirror. Thereby they came to see that they were sinful, both in a hereditary and in an active way. They thereby saw their many faults, weaknesses and lacks. They saw themselves defiled by the disgraces, very weak in all of the graces and lacking in some degree in all of them and entirely in some of them. Thus they gave them a knowledge and conviction of their sins and sinfulness. The agents, by handing them the razor of the Law's exposures, also announced their condemnation by the Law, which many of them mistakenly magnified into an eternal torture sentence, to the injury of those who imbibed this error and its consequent effects. But the Lord quietly ignored this error and in spite of it properly disposed many to the shaving of their symbolic hair. These agents further handed the prospective faith-justified this razor by cutting off from them every hope of their being able by its use to please God, remove His sentence from them and work out their own justification. Thus their handing the razor to these gave them a knowledge of right and wrong, of their sins, a recognition of their sinfulness, a saddening consciousness of their condemnation, a conviction of their inability to right matters between them and God and escape sin's condemnation. Thus upon the anvil of the Law their hearts were crushed, figuratively speaking, to pieces, which is what *contrition* means.

(13) These agents did not do the shaving. Each one of the prospective faith-justified had to do this himself. Preliminary to this shaving he had to accept the razor at the hands of those who held it up to him. This

means that each one had to look at the razor and see it in its details and uses, *i.e.*, each one had attentively to study the nature, principles, demands, promised rewards arid threatened punishments of the Law. Furthermore, he had to reach out his figurative hand—belief—and accept this razor, which means that he had to believe the Law's delineation of him, *i.e.*, accept the knowledge of sin that it wrought, and as a result become convinced that he was a sinner. Moreover, his accepting this razor implied that he acknowledged that he was justly condemned by the Law's exposures and was unable by any of his powers to escape its penalties and right himself with God. And, finally, his accepting it implies his willingness to receive it for shaving purposes. That hair in Biblical symbols means *powers*, is evident from Samson's hair and the hairs like women's hairs in Rev. 9: 8—powers like those of churches. Sins are powers of a certain kind—the sinners' expressed powers of having the right to violate justice. But such powers—sins—must be removed. Repentance puts one into a state of heart and mind in which he no longer desires to have and use such powers, and it is the exposures of the Law—the symbolic razor—that the contrite sinner applies to himself as the means of severing from himself such powers. The symbolic act of shaving, therefore, means that the sinner severs from himself his sins as powers formerly had and used. For one of the ingredients of repentance is putting aside the love, the habits and practice of sins as powers of the sinner. Thus we see that both the antitypical waters of separation and the antitypical razor used in shaving all of the sinner's flesh—every part of his heart and mind, in which sins as powers were—combined to work repentance, which consists of knowledge of right and wrong in general and of one's own wrongs in particular, a conviction of one's sinfulness, a recognition of one's condemnation and his inability to save himself, a hatred of sin, a determination to sever sin from oneself,

an honest and measurably successful effort at such severance, and, finally, a love for, and an honest and measurably successful effort in the practice of righteousness. The antitypical waters of separation and the razor accomplish all of the foregoing features of repentance, except the last one that we mentioned.

(14) This last part of repentance is accomplished by the third and final cleansing process—the washing of the clothes. In Biblical symbols clothes or garments are used to represent the graces. Just as our natural clothes are, among other things, used to cover our nakedness, so are symbolic clothes worn to cover our symbolic nakedness, which represents our faults-the *dis*graces (Rev. 16: 15). St. Peter shows that the graces are symbolized by garments when he exhorts us to be clothed with humility (1 Pet. 5: 5) , and the sisters to be adorned with meekness and gentleness (1 Pet. 3: 3, 4). St. Paul gives a similar exhortation (1 Tim. 2: 9, 10). He also speaks of our clothing ourselves with sympathy, kindness, humility, meekness, longsuffering, forbearance and forgiveness, which therefore, are symbolic clothes. But just as our literal clothes become spotted and dirty, so our symbolic clothes sometimes become spotted and dirty (Jude 23; 2; Cor. 7: 1). When our faults—*dis*graces—are removed, we are spoken of as unspotted (Cant. 4: 7; Eph. 5: 27; 1 Tim. 6: 14; 2 Pet. 3: 14). Christ's symbolic garments never had any spots (Heb. 9: 14; 1 Pet. 1: 19). Furthermore, in Biblical symbols, in its office of cleansing from the power of sin the Word of God is spoken of as symbolic water (Eph. 5: 26; Heb. 10: 22; John 15: 3; Tit. 3: 5). These considerations enable us to see what is typed by the prospective Levites' washing their clothes—it symbolizes that the prospective antitypical Levites remove from their graces whatever faults of their depraved nature cleave to them, by an application to them of the pertinent cleansing parts of God's Word. Those who have been candidates for

faith-justification have had more or less of vestiges of God's image in them naturally; but these were more or less contaminated—spotted—by depravity—faults. These faults must be removed that the qualities of righteousness that they contaminate might become free from such contamination, and this occurs through applying such parts of the cleansing Word as remove these faults from those graces; and this usually is done by those parts of the Word that make those graces work oppositionally to those faults, which thereby are removed. This implies love for, and the practice of the graces of righteousness, whereby through the cleansing Word the prospective faith-justified cleanse away from their symbolic garments the spots and dirt of sin that have accumulated thereon. By the repentant sinner doing what he can to cleanse by the Word his good qualities from the faults that adhere to them, he completes the repentance process—the Gospel-Age antitype of the cleansing of the Levites as set forth in the type given in Num. 8: 6, 7.

(15) Dropping the figure, it would be in place for us to explain in literal language the step of repentance, which, in the general type, was represented by the Levites' starting out from the camp and making their way toward the door of the tabernacle. In the specific type under study it shows what both the Lord and the repentant sinner do as to the three cleansing processes of v. 7. The Greek noun translated *repentance is metanoia* and the corresponding Greek verb translated *to repent is metanoein.* Literally, the verb means *to change the mind* or *disposition*, and, literally, the noun means *a change of mind* or *disposition*. It, therefore, imports a change in the mental, moral and religious attitude toward sin and righteousness as respects God and man. The change in the mental attitude implies giving up errors as to sin and accepting truths thereon and giving up errors as to righteousness and accepting truths thereon. The change in the moral attitude implies

the giving up of the love and practice of sin and the hatred, omission and violation of righteousness manward and the acceptance of hatred and avoidance of sin and the love and practice of righteousness manward. The change in the religious attitude implies the giving up of the love and practice of sin Godward and the hatred, omission and violation of righteousness Godward and the acceptance of hatred and avoidance of sin Godward and the love and practice of righteousness Godward. Sorrow for sin, contrition, is inseparably implied in such hatred for sin and love for righteousness, because from both of these feelings one must sorrow over having loved and practiced sin and hatred, avoided and violated righteousness. Yea, the keenest sorrow experienced by man is remorse—real contrition for sin. It is for this reason that true repentance is so heavily freighted with grief, as is shown, *e.g.*, in the penitential Psalms: 6; 32; 38; 51; 102; 130; 143. Such a grief is Biblically called a godly sorrow and sorrow unto repentance (2 Cor. 7: 9-11).

(16) The following is an analysis of the things that constitute the Scriptural parts of repentance as to sin: intellectual conviction of sin (John 8: 9); heart's sorrow for sin (Matt. 11: 21; 2 Cor. 7: 9-11; Rom. 7: 24); hatred of sin (Deut. 7: 26; Rom. 7: 15); abandonment of sin (Prov. 28: 13; Matt. 3: 8); confession of sin (Ezra 10: 1; Neh. 9: 2; Prov. 28: 13; Matt. 3: 6; Acts 19: 18); restitution for sin (Lev. 6: 4, 5; Ezek. 33: 15; Luke 19: 8); and opposition to sin (Rom. 7: 15, 19, 23). The following are the ideas that constitute the Biblical parts of repentance as to righteousness: (1) love for righteousness (Rom. 12: 9; 7: 22); practice of righteousness (Rom. 6: 19-21; Acts 26: 20); and warfare for righteousness. (2 Cor. 7: 11; 10: 5; Heb. 12: 4). Thus repentance has two features: one as to sin, the other as to righteousness. In its feature as to sin it has seven distinct parts, and in its feature as to righteousness it has three parts. Thus

in both features it has ten parts. This we know—both from the Bible and from our experiences, as well as from those of others who have exercised repentance. It might be further added that repentance is the first great step toward justification, the other step toward justification being faith (Mark 1: 15; Acts 20: 21). When both of these steps are taken one attains justification by faith.

(17) The following is an analysis of the New Testament passages in which the verb *metanoein* (*to repent*) and the noun *metanoia* (*repentance*) occur, the verb occurrences coming first: People should repent because of the nearness of the kingdom (Matt. 3: 2; 4: 17; Mark 1: 15); John preached to repent (Acts 2: 38; 17: 30); not to repent is disapproved and to repent is approved (Matt. 11: 20, 21; Luke 10: 13; 11: 32); preaching is to effect it (Matt. 12: 41; Mark 6: 12); some do not repent (Luke 13: 3, 5; 16: 30; 2 Cor. 12: 21; Rev. 2: 5, 21, 22; 9: 20, 21; 16: 9, 11); it is commanded (Acts 3: 19; 8: 22; 26: 20; Rev. 2: 5, 16; 3: 3, 19); it causes joy in heaven (Luke 15: 7, 10); and we are to forgive the repentant (Luke 17: 3, 4). Now follows an analysis of the passages in which the noun *metanoia* occurs: John's baptism was for repentance (Matt. 3: 11; 9 13; Mark 1: 4; 2: 17; Luke 3: 3; 5: 32; Acts 13: 24; 19: 4); God's goodness leads to it (Rom. 2: 4; 2 Pet. 3: 9); it is to be preached (Luke 24: 47; Heb. 6: 1); sorrow is a feature of it (2 Cor. 7: 9, 10; Heb. 6: 6); sometimes sorrow cannot effect it in the sense of a change of mind in others (Heb. 12: 17); it is a gift of God (Acts 5: 31; 11: 18; 2 Tim. 2: 25); the sinless do not need it (Luke 15: 7); fruits worthy of it should follow (Matt. 3: 8; Luke 3: 8; Acts 26: 20); and it is to be exercised toward God (Acts 20: 21). According to this analysis of the Biblical use of these two words, repentance is a very important part of man's coming into a proper relationship with God and man.

(18) Above we discussed the Gospel-Age antitype of Num. 8: 5-7 and found therein a remarkable typical description of how our Lord throughout the Age has brought sinners to repentance, as the first part of the cleansing of Gospel-Age Levites, for which they had to be prepared by certain providential and instructional experiences (v. 6). We found in harmony with v. 7 that three distinct processes bring sinners to repentance: (1) the application to them of the types and antitypes of the Ancient Worthies; (2) the use of God's Law as to their sins and sinfulness; and (3) the use of the cleansing parts of God's Word on their natural good qualities. By these being ministered to them through suitable agents and by their subjecting themselves to the influence of these three things, repentance toward God is wrought in them unto a completion. Neither can we think of any other ways that can be employed to accomplish this effect; nor do these two things need reinforcement by any other thing to secure this result. The above-mentioned three processes alone are requisite to work a full and real repentance in properly disposed hearts. This, of course, is what we should expect; because the all-wise God, who charged our Lord Jesus to accomplish this work, is to be presupposed to know just with what such a work was to be accomplished. With respect to all of His works, and therefore with respect to this one, we can well say: He hath done all things well!

(19) But repentance is not sufficient for more than a measure of cleansing from the power of sin. It cannot cleanse from the guilt or condemnation of sin. This Christ's blood alone can do, as the poet has so well put it in one of the finest of our hymns.

"Could my tears forever flow,
Could my zeal no languor know,
These for sin could not atone;
Thou hast saved and Thou alone.
In my hand no price I bring;
Simply to Thy cross I cling."

If the work of our cleansing would stop with repentance, we would never have been completely cleansed so as to be regarded as clean by God. The three processes above referred to, indeed, have their part to accomplish in our cleansing, but their part is only a part of that cleansing. The Law is helpless to complete this cleansing; for in the cleansing work it goes no further than giving us a will not to sin and a will to do right; but it does not justify us. It has come to the full end of its purpose when it has made us know that we cannot save ourselves, and, therefore, stand in need of a Savior apart from ourselves. But, blessed be the grace and mercy of our God, that there is a Helper who is able to save unto the uttermost them that come to God by Him, seeing that He ever liveth and maketh intercession for them. But the Law does not offer Him to us. The Law cannot work such a faith in our hearts that accepts Him as our Savior. Herein the Law is helpless, not that it in itself is weak, but because of our weakness (Rom. 8: 3). But what the Law cannot, on account of our weakness accomplish, the Gospel can and does accomplish (Rom. 8: 14). And this ability of the Gospel is brought to our attention in v. 8. As we have seen, the Law feature of God's Word is active in all three processes set forth in v. 7. Its having been preached and applied unto repentance, the next feature of the cleansing process—the preaching of the Gospel—should be brought to our attention, and this is done in v. 8, where the message—the Gospel of reconciliation to God—that works a justifying faith is brought to our consideration in a typical way, so concealed that unless the three typical sacrifices therein set forth are understood, the connection of Law and Gospel, as set forth in vs. 7 and 8, and how the preaching of the Gospel is set forth in v. 8, cannot be seen.

(20) Three typical sacrifices are brought to view in v. 8: (1) a burnt-offering; (2) a meat-offering mingled

with oil; and (3) a sin-offering. The first bullock is not in this verse called a burnt-offering; but it is called such in v. 12. It will be further noted that the second bullock is not called a trespass-offering; for that would imply our Lord to have been a sinner; but it is specifically called a sin-offering. From this we can see that it relates to our Lord in connection with His personal sinless sacrifice as the first sin-offering of the antitypical Atonement Day. The Scriptures certainly assure us that He is the antitypical Bullock (Heb. 7: 27; 10: 5-9; 13: 11, 12). Hence the allusion contained in the bullock for the sin-offering in v. 8 is to our Lord's death as a sin-offering (2 Cor. 5: 21, 18, 19; Rom. 5: 6, 8; 8: 3; Heb. 2: 9; 9: 28). This, as we know, has been very ably set before us in the first part of chapter 4 of Tabernacle Shadows. We, therefore, note that Christ's death as a sin-offering is alluded to in the bullock of the sin-offering in v. 8. Let us keep this thought in mind and after other explanations have been made we will prove it to be so.

(21) Additionally, a bullock for a burnt-offering is also brought to our attention in v. 8. We are not to understand that this types another sacrifice that our Lord would make of Himself personally. He made one and only one sacrifice of Himself individually (Heb. 7: 27; 10: 14; Rom. 6: 8, 9); and it needs no repetition, as did that of the typical bullock. If, then, the burnt-offering does not typify another sacrifice of Himself that our Lord would bring, what does it represent? We reply, it represents God's manifested acceptance of our Lord's sacrifice (T 72, par. 3; 81, par. 2). How do we know that the burnt-offering represents God's manifested acceptance of the sacrifice of which it was the burnt-offering? We reply, that it was only with burnt-offerings that God ever connected a special sign of acceptance, as can be seen in the case of Abraham's offering Isaac as a burnt-offering, being manifested as acceptable by the giving of the oathbound

covenant (Gen. 22: 2, 7, 8, 13, 16-18), the burnt-offering of Aaron (Lev. 9: 23, 24), that of David (1 Chro. 21: 26, 27), those of Solomon (2 Chro. 7: 1-3) and that of Elijah (1 Kings 18: 36-39), being manifested in acceptance by fire.

(22) In the antitype God manifests His acceptance of the sacrifice in a variety of ways for the various classes, *e.g.*, in the Millennium He will manifest His acceptance of the sacrifice of the Christ for the world by the restitution blessings that the Christ will minister, typed by Aaron offering the burnt-offering. During the Gospel-Age He manifests His acceptance of our Lord's sacrifice for the Church by bestowing, through Jesus' ministry, upon the Church His Holy Spirit, the Truth and the privileges of ministering to, and suffering for the Truth. Neither of these manifestations of God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice is referred to in v. 8; for the burnt-offering here referred to applies for the tentatively justified, *i.e.*, the Gospel-Age Levites. And how did God manifest His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice on behalf of these? If we can answer this question aright, we will be prepared better to understand the office of the burnt-offering referred to in v. 8. God has manifested His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice for the tentatively justified: first, by tentatively forgiving them their sins; second, by tentatively imputing to them Christ's righteousness; third, by taking them into friendship with Himself; fourth, by preparing them for the Gospel-Age Levitical service; fifth, by giving them opportunities to grow in Levitical knowledge, character and service; sixth, by advancing them toward consecration; and, seventh, by inviting them to consecrate, all of these ministered to them by our Lord. The last three manifestations were not really preparations for Leviteship as such, but preparations for the priesthood offered tentative Levites who were loyal in their tentative justification. From the facts of the case, as preparatory for justification,

we gather that the bullock of the burnt-offering was connected especially with the first three of the above-expressed manifestations of God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice in relation to the faith justified.

(23) But the exact part that the two bullocks play for the antitype of v. 8 cannot be seen until we come to recognize the antitype of the meat-offering. In T 98, par. 4, the significance of the meat-offerings is brought to our attention. There our dear Pastor says that they represented praises and worship offered to Jehovah. When we speak of praising God, we mean saying and doing what reflects credit upon Him in His person, character, plan and works, just as, *e.g.*, we would praise Mr. Edison when we say of him things that reflect credit upon him in his works of invention. We worship God, not only, as many think, exclusively by prayer and song, but we also do it by whole-heartedly serving Him and His cause. That worship means also such service is evident from the parallelism of Matt. 4: 10; and by what Satan wanted our Lord to do to him, *i.e.*, become fully subject to Satan in service. The following passages prove that to *worship* also means to *serve*: Ps. 45: 11; Matt. 15: 9; Acts 18: 13; 24: 14; Heb. 1: 6; Rev. 11: 1; 14: 9, 11; 16: 2; 20: 4. How, then, is the antitypical meat-offering made? By serving God's cause through the faithful proclamation of His Truth, which reflects credit upon His person, character, plan and works. Thus the meat-offering is presented by ministering the Lord's Truth in a proper spirit. This is implied in the meat-offering as consisting of fine flour, typing spiritual food, mingled with oil, typing the spirit of understanding. Thus the meat-offering shows how the sacrifice is carried out, *i.e.*, by faithful service on behalf of God in the form of proclaiming the Truth.

(24) In view of the fact that three forms of the typical sacrifices are in v. 8 brought to our attention, it might be well for us to look briefly by way of comparison

and contrast at all of the forms of the typical sacrifices and at what they type. We remark that each different form of typical sacrifice does not represent a different antitypical sacrifice; but different phases of the antitypical sacrifice, *e.g.*, our Lord offered an antitypical sin-offering, burnt-offering, meat-offering, peace-offering, free-will offering, thank-offering and praise-offering. This does not mean that He offered seven different sacrifices. Of His own person He offered only one. Yet He offered the antitypes of the above-mentioned seven sacrifices. What do they mean? Seven different aspects of His one sacrifice, as follows: His sin-offering brings out the sin atoning character of His sacrifice. His burnt-offering brings out the effect of that sacrifice on God, *i.e.*, it effects a manifested acceptance of that sacrifice on God's part. His meat-offering brings out the thought that He carried out His sacrifice by a ministry of the Truth which reflected credit on the Father in His person, character, plan and work. His offering His peace-offering brings out the thought that His sacrifice was a fulfillment of His vows and covenant of sacrifice, made by Him to the Lord. His fiee-will offering brings out the thought of His carrying out His sacrifice most voluntarily and willingly. His thank-offering brings out the thought that Christ's sacrifice was in harmony with duty-love, justice, which, exercised Godward, always includes gratitude as due to God, and which never was enacted out of harmony with such duty-love. And, finally, the praise-offering brings out the thought that Christ's sacrifice flowed out of, and was filled with disinterested love. The same phases of the Church's one sacrifice are alluded to by the types. Accordingly, the seven typical sacrifices do not type seven antitypical sacrifices, but seven different phases of the one sacrifice of Christ and the one sacrifice of the Church. Certain of such like phases will find their antitypes in the world's consecrated services during the next Age.

(25) With the above explanations we are prepared to understand the antitype of v. 8; and by that understanding we can see the wonderful connection brought out antitypically between vs. 7 and 8. The meat-offering of v. 8 suggests that its antitype is preaching a truth or truths that reflect credit on God; while the sin-offering referred to in connection with the meat-offering suggests the thought that this preaching is that of the atoning death of Christ; and the burnt-offering referred to in connection with the meat-offering suggests the thought that the involved preaching is that which explains how God manifests His acceptance of Christ's atoning death. This He does in connection with the stage to which matters have attained so far as v. 8 is concerned by promising through the pertinent preaching to forgive the repentant and believing sinner, to impute to him Christ's righteousness and to take him into friendship, fellowship, peace with God. The connection between v. 8, which symbolizes the preaching of the grace and mercy of God to the repentant, and v. 7, is this: While v. 7 brings out how the application of the Law to responsive sinners brings them to repentance, the next step is to preach the elements of the Gospel—those fundamental to working a justifying faith—to the repentant sinners, which is brought out in v. 8. Thus the antitype shows a most marvelous theoretical and practical connection to prevail between vs. 7 and 8. For was this not the order of the pertinent events in our own experiences, while we were on the way toward justification? Every consecrated person, looking back at the way in which he was drawn out of the antitypical Camp toward the Gate of the antitypical Court, recognizes that his experiences were along the line of the antitypes that we have suggested for vs. 7 and 8, which, of course, corroborates the exposition as factual. Our proof passages show it to be Scriptural.

(26) But let us look a little more closely at the antitype of v. 8, so as to bring into clearer view its antitypical

teachings. It is certainly true that after God's agents in fulfilling the antitypes of v. 7 brought us to repentance, they [these are the *them* of v. 8] certainly preached [the meat-offering] the fundamentals of the Gospel message connected with justification as the sole remedy for the lost undone condition, of which as repentant sinners we were made so grievously aware (Rom. 8: 3, 4; 5: 6; Acts 4: 12). Such preaching set forth God's love for the lost and condemned race for its salvation from the curse (Deut. 23: 5; Is. 38: 17; Jer. 31: 3; Eph. 2: 4, 5; Titus 2: 11; 3: 4; 1 Tim. 2: 4; 4: 10). It further set forth the fact that His love for the lost race was so great that He gave up His only begotten Son to death to become a sin-offering for the race (Is. 53: 4-12; John 3: 16, 17; Rom. 5: 6, 8; 8: 32; 2 Cor. 5: 18, 21; 1 Tim. 2: 5; 1 John 4: 9, 10). Such preaching also made known that Christ was sinless (Ps. 45: 7; Is. 42: 21; 53: 9; Zech. 9: 9; Luke 1: 35; John 8: 46; Acts 3: 14; Heb. 4: 15; 7: 26; 1 Pet. 1: 19; 2: 22; 1 John 3: 5). It then set forth the thought that He was suitable for a sin-offering (Is. 53: 10-12; Rom. 8: 3). Such preaching as to Christ as a sin-offering showed that He actually did die for our sins as a sin-offering on our behalf (Matt. 20: 28; John 1: 29; 3: 14-17; 6: 51; 10: 11, 17; Acts 20: 28; 1 Cor. 5: 7; 8: 11; 15: 3; 2 Cor. 5: 14, 15; Gal. 1: 4; 3: 13; 4: 4, 5; Heb. 2: 9; 9: 26, 28; 10: 12; 13: 11, 12; 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19; 2: 21, 24; 3: 18). And, finally, it set forth the thought that His sacrifice as a sin-offering was effective for propitiation (Is. 53: 4-12; Dan. 9: 24, 26; Rom. 3: 24-26; 2 Cor. 5: 19, 21; Col. 1: 20; Heb. 1: 3; 1 John 1: 7; 2: 2; 4: 10). Without any doubt, from Pentecost on to the present time, such preaching was made to the penitent by the agents that Christ has used toward them, and that we mentioned above.

(27) In setting forth the antitype of the sin-offering, the acts of God resulting from its presentation to Him are not included; and for this reason they are not

set forth in the preceding paragraph, which. is limited to the things preached as the antitype of bringing forth the bullock of the sin-offering. These acts of God are set forth as the antitype of the bringing forth of the burnt-offering, which, as we have seen, types God's manifested acceptance of the sin-offering. These acts of God, as related to the faith-justified, and as stated above, are three: (1) the forgiveness of sins; (2) the imputation of Christ's righteousness and (3) the acceptance of the repentant and believing sinner into friendship. All three of these acts are the Father's exclusively; for He alone is the originating cause of justification (Rom. 8: 33), which consists of the forgiveness of sins and the imputation of Christ's righteousness, as a result of which two things peace—friendship—is established between God and those just justified. We are not to understand that v. 8, in telling of the bringing of the sin-offering, types Christ's death; for that death occurred before the antitype of v. 8 set in. If, then, it does not type that death, what does it type? We reply, it types *the preaching* [the meat-offering] of Christ's death (Luke 24: 47) from Pentecost on unto the end of the Gospel-Age; for let us remember that v. 8 types things done after ["then," v. 8] repentance has, according to v. 7, been wrought in the prospective Gospel-Age Levites. Hence the sin-offering of Christ was completed before the things of v. 8 could occur in the antitype. Nor does the bringing of the burnt-offering of v. 8 type God's manifestation of His acceptance of Christ's sin-offering, but the preaching of the thoughts descriptive of that act. But in the nature of the case the *preaching of the thoughts* that God works out in the acts of manifesting His acceptance of Christ's sin-offering must for each individual on the way to justification precede those manifesting acts themselves; for that preaching is the means of awakening a justifying faith, which must be awakened before justification sets in; and, as we know,

it is in the two parts-acts-of justification and its resultant peace that the manifestation of God's acceptance of Christ's sin-offering consists, so far as that act is related to the stage of matters treated of in v. 8. Hence v. 8 refers exclusively to the *preaching* of the truths on the antitypical sin-offering and burnt-offering, and not to the *enacting* of the sin-offering and burnt-offering. And this is typically shown by v. 8 connecting the meat-offering with the other two.

(28) Having seen that it is a fact of our and others' experiences, as well as a Scriptural teaching, that to the repentant sinner God caused the truths related to Christ as a sin-offering to be preached, we now proceed to show that it is also a fact that throughout the Age, according to our and others' experiences and the Scriptural teaching, the truths relating to God's manifested acceptance of the sin-offering, *i.e.*, the antitypical burnt-offering, have been preached to the repentant at God's command. Such preaching we understand to be represented by the language of v. 8: "Then [after doing what is stated in v. 7] let them take a young bullock [for a burnt-offering; see v. 12] with his meat-offering, even fine flour mingled with oil." This fine flour represents the thoroughly detailed features of the pertinent truths presented and the oil represents the spirit of understanding with which these truths should be set forth. The first of these truths implied in the burnt-offering and meat-offering from the standpoint of v. 8 is that God as the first manifestation of His acceptance of Christ's sin-offering forgives the sins of the repentant and believing sinner; and the second of these truths is that to such sinners God imputes Christ's righteousness. These two truths describe God's act of justification; for God justifies one by forgiving him his sins and by imputing to him Christ's righteousness. By these two things the believer is brought into harmony with God's Law; for by forgiving him his sins God removes the condemnation of the Law for his past sins

(Rom. 3: 25, 26), and by imputing Christ's righteousness to him He makes him imputatively fulfill its demands that he be righteous henceforth (Rom. 8: 3, 4; 10: 4). Naturally as an outflow from such justification friendship (peace) sets in between God and him, as the third feature of God's manifesting the acceptableness of Christ's sacrifice for sinners (Rom. 5: 1). Accordingly, by justifying the believing sinner and receiving him into friendship, God plainly manifests that He has accepted Christ's sacrifice for sinners. How could it be manifested more clearly?

(29) That the Bible teaches that God's forgiveness of the repentant and believing sinner is a proof of God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice for sin, is manifest from many Scriptures. The following are some of these: Is. 53: 10-12; Zech. 9: 10; 12: 10—13: 1; Matt. 26: 28; Acts 5: 30; 13: 38; Rom. 3: 24-26; 4: 7, 8, 25; 5: 9-12; Eph. 1: 7; 2: 13-16; 4: 32; 5: 2; Col. 1: 14, 20-22; 2: 14; 1 Thes. 1: 10; Heb. 9: 14, 22, 24-28; 10: 18; 1 John 1: 7, 9; 2: 1, 2, 12. That to declare such forgiveness of sins as a part of the Gospel message that God has commanded to be preached is a Scriptural teaching, is evident from the following Scriptures: Luke 24: 47; John 20: 23; Acts 1: 8; 2: 38, 39; 3: 19, 26; 4: 17-22; 5: 31, 32; 13: 38; 26: 16-18. Certainly such a message was by the Apostles preached, as many of the above Scriptures prove; and this same preaching was done throughout the Age. We who have passed through the experience of justification know that, after the Law had completed its work of effecting repentance in us, not only our Lord's death was preached to us as a sin-offering, but it was also preached to us that for the merit of that death God would forgive us our sins, if we exercised the necessary faith. Hence from experience we know that the preaching of forgiveness for the merit of Christ has been done, *i.e.*, that this feature of Christ's burnt-offering has been preached (coupled with the meat-offering).

(30) We further know from the Scriptures and our and others' experiences that the second phase of Christ's burnt-offering has been preached (coupled with the meat-offering) throughout the Gospel-Age. That second feature of Christ's burnt-offering is God's imputing Christ's righteousness to the repentant and believing sinners. That God does impute Christ's righteousness to such, the Bible certainly teaches. Such a thing would have to be done in order to keep us in a justified condition; for the natural and Mosaic Law does not only demand the death of a sinner, but it also demands perfect obedience from all under it; and such an obedience we can render only imputatively, *i.e.*, through the imputed righteousness of Christ. This is what those passages mean that teach that He is our righteousness and perfection (Rom. 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Col. 2: 10; 2 Cor. 12: 9). This, too, is what those passages mean which tell us that we are justified by the faith [faithfulness, righteousness] of Christ (Rom. 3: 21, 22; Gal. 2: 16; 3: 22; Phil. 3: 9). Of course, such a righteousness could not be made ours instantaneously in any other way than by imputation. We can see how it could be made another's by the Millennial works, *i.e.*, actually; for a thousand years of effort assisted by Christ's ministry could make it become his by works (Jer. 23: 5, 6; 33: 14-17); but it is impossible to become another's instantaneously, except by imputation; and since it does become ours the instant we exercise the pertinent faith, it must become ours by imputation. So the Apostles preached it to the penitent, as the above citations prove. So have others since that time preached it to repentant sinners. All of us by experience know that while we were in the condition of repentance the Lord caused this message to be proclaimed to us: God has accepted the sacrifice of Christ and will prove to you that He has, by imputing Christ's righteousness to you, if you heartily believe His promise so to do. Thus we know that the

antitype of the second feature of Christ's burnt-offering has been preached throughout the Gospel-Age.

(31) So, too, has the third feature of that burnt-offering (peace with God) been preached throughout the Gospel-Age. Sin in ultimate analysis is a repudiation and defiance of, and a rebellion against God. It by act removes one from subjection to God and makes one subject to God's enemy, Satan. As a result, it makes God an enemy of the sinner and it separates him from God so thoroughly that God no more has fellowship and friendship with the sinner. He is thus estranged from the sinner, holding Himself aloof from him. On the thought that sinners are abhorrent to the Lord the Bible gives us much testimony (Num. 22: 32; Deut. 25: 16; 32: 19; 2 Sam. 11: 27; 1 Kings 14: 22; Ps. 5: 4-6; 10: 3; .11: 5; 78: 59; 106: 40; Prov. 3: 32; 16: 16-19; 15: 8, 9, 26; 21: 27; Is. 43: 24; Jer. 25: 7; Hab. 1: 13; Zech. 8: 17; Luke 16: 15; Rev. 2: 6, 15). So, too, does it abundantly teach that God is by sin separated from the sinner, and holds Himself aloof from him (Deut. 31: 17; Josh. 7: 12; 2 Chron. 24: 20; Job 13: 24; 23: 3, 8, 9; Ps. 78: 59-61; Is. 59: 1, 2; 64: 7; Ezek. 23: 18; Hos. 9: 12; Amos 3: 2, 3; Mic. 3: 4; Luke 13: 27). One of the keenest griefs of the truly penitent is their consciousness of resting under God's displeasure and abhorrence, kept away from Him by His hiding His face, favor, from them (2 Sam. 24: 10; Ps. 38: 3, 4; Is. 64: 5-7). And one of the ways that God has of manifesting His acceptance of Christ's sin-offering, is the setting aside of His displeasure with the repentant and believing sinner and receiving him into friendship and fellowship. The following are some Scriptures that teach this thought: Is. 12: 1; 27: 5; 48: 18; 53: 5; Luke 1: 79; Rom. 5: 1; Eph. 2: 14-16; Col. 1: 20. And this fact has been preached [the meat-offering] by the Apostles (Acts 10: 36; Rom. 10: 15; Eph. 2: 17). This has been done by the Lord's agents ever since; and we know from

our own experience that while we were in the throes of remorse there was preached to us the comforting message that Christ's death avails for the taking away of God's displeasure from us and for making God a friend of ours. Thus we see that the antitypical meat-offering brought to us the assurance of this feature of the antitypical burnt-offering. Thus the Bible and our and others' experiences prove that every feature of the antitypical burnt-offering was preached to the prospective faith justified during the Gospel-Age.

(32) We again stress the thought that v. 8 refers antitypically exclusively to the *preaching* of those features of the Gospel that are adapted to draw the truly repentant into faith. It does not describe the effect of that preaching on them, *i.e.*, its working faith in them and their exercising such a faith unto justification. It simply describes the part that God's animate and inanimate agents have to perform upon the repentant preparatory to their exercising faith. The effect intended to be wrought by their preaching, while not set forth in v. 8, is set forth in v. 12, as we will see when we come to the exposition of that verse. But as we consider the typical severing work of v. 6, the typical cleansing work of v. 7 and the typical taking in hand of the three kinds of sacrifices of v. 8, and then consider what has been set forth above as the antitypes of these, and furthermore compare these suggested antitypes with the pertinent Biblical teachings and the experiences of others and of ourselves, the harmony of all these things demonstrates to our hearts and minds that the Lord has given us the true understanding of the type. This adds to the demonstration of our Pastor's teaching on tentative justification as a favor that the Gospel-Age Levites have had from the Lord through faith in God's promises in view of Christ's sacrificial death for the world and, therefore, for them. We trust that our feast on the four verses so far studied in this chapter will serve further to whet our appetites for the

other good things of Divinely provided food that Num. 8: 9-26 puts on our well laden table. And our citing so many Scriptures above is to impress deeply upon our hearts and minds the great stress that the Bible lays on the truths associated with making responsive people Gospel-Age Levites; for while faith justification is not the main purpose of the Gospel-Age, as many mistakenly suppose, it is certainly fundamental to God's Gospel-Age work. Hence the great stress that the Bible in its typical and non-typical teachings thereon lays on it and all its associated, especially its precedingly associated, doctrines.

(33) We would naturally expect that the things recorded in v. 12 would follow immediately in this chapter the things recorded in v. 8; but for good reasons the things described in vs. 9-11 are introduced before those discussed in v. 12. The reasons are these: Some of the things in vs. 9-11 chronologically precede the things set forth in v. 12; yea, some of them even precede the things performed in vs. 7 and 8. Nevertheless, had they been presented entirely in their chronological order the antitype would not be so easily traced as from the actual order of their presentation, while the presentation in the order in which they are given does make the run of the antitypical thoughts more easily discerned. One of the thoughts that vs. 9-11 brings out is the publicity of the dealings with the prospective Levites in the type and antitype. V. 9 shows that all of the dealings with those who were about to be made Levites, who were about to be put under preparation for Levitical service, and who were about to be inducted into the Levitical service, were to be done publicly. When v. 9, in its first clause, says that Moses should bring the Levites before the tabernacle of the congregation, it charges that the entire service with the antitypical Levites should be done publicly, in the presence of the true Church, typed by the tabernacle (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17; 2 Cor. 6: 16; Rev. 11: 1, 2;

15: 5; Heb. 8: 2; 9: 11; Rev. 13: 6; 21: 3). Again, when the second clause of v. 9 says that Moses was to gather the whole assembly of the children of Israel, it types the fact that the things done to and for the antitypical Levites should be publicly performed before the whole nominal people of God in the antitypical camp. Publicity, therefore, was to mark both the typical and antitypical transactions with the Levites, as a Divine requirement.

(34) To make this clearer we remark that in the type and antitype there were three distinct things done with the Levites before they were ready to serve as Levites. Here, of the type, we use the word Levite, not to denote the non-sacred standing of Levi's non-priestly descendants before they assumed the standing of the sacred tribe; but we use it in the sense of their becoming and being this sacred tribe. To accomplish their transition from their standing as a non-sacred tribe to their standing as servants of the tabernacle, "My holy Levites," especially three sets of things had to be done to them: (1) the series of acts described in vs. 6-8, 12; (2) their being waved as a wave-offering, as described in v. 11; and (3) their being directly offered before Aaron and his sons to the Lord, as set forth in v. 13. All of these acts had to be done publicly. The type plainly brings out the publicity of all three of these acts. And each one of these typical transactions has had its antitype and in each case the antitype has been publicly enacted. Furthermore, according to the typical teachings of v. 9, these three things had to be done before the new creatures, typed by the tabernacle, and before the world, *i.e.*, the nominal spiritual Israel, typed by the whole assembly of Israel. And this certainly was done publicly before these two classes both in the ritualistic and non-ritualistic churches, members of which were not only the nominal-church people, but also new creatures, until

during the Harvest, when God has been calling them out of Babylon to symbolic Palestine.

(35) As we saw above, in the ritualistic churches, mainly by home teaching and by catechetical instruction, responsive sinners were brought to repentance and faith and thus to justification. And in such churches those who by the above methods were brought to justification were introduced to the attention of the entire church membership in their particular ecclesias, as undergoing such experiences as catechumen. But this was done in a still more impressive and public way by a solemn public rite that all of the ritualistic churches have practiced, *i.e.*, confirmation. Practically every member of such ecclesias would be present at a confirmation service. We are not to be understood as meaning that all that underwent this rite were justified. Rather, only those who submitted themselves to their home and catechetical instruction in the way of repentance and faith attained to justification. Accordingly, such in their catechetical instruction and confirmation publicly were regarded as exercising repentance and faith by the new-creaturely and non-new-creaturely members of their ecclesias. And in their confirmation service they publicly confessed repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. And these antitypically as such were brought by our Lord before the antitypical Tabernacle and the whole congregation of antitypical Israel. This is true of all of them in the sense that each one in all ecclesias was individually brought before all the members of his local ecclesia. Furthermore, the same procedure in principle, but in a different form, was carried out by those who in non-ritualistic churches were brought through repentance and faith to justification. Here the main forms of influencing them to justification were home training and preaching. Other methods than these were, of course, used in both ritualistic and non-ritualistic churches, as pointed out above, but

above we have indicated the main ones used in both sets of churches, both relying on home teaching and each differing in the official method that their pertinent churches as such used, catechetical instruction prevailing in the one set, and preaching prevailing in the other set. The preaching was usually done by evangelists, revivalists and pastors. And such services were given wide publicity and were, as a rule, attended by the full church membership; and those who through such services professed to have been brought to justification, which would, of course, include those who really did repent and believe, were publicly noted as such by the new-creaturely and non-new-creaturely members of the pertinent ecclesias. Accordingly, in both sets of churches publicity before all church members was given to the repentance, faith and justification of those who really underwent these experiences. Thus they were brought before both the antitypical Tabernacle and whole congregation of antitypical Israel. When in more private ways people were brought to justification, they always made a public confession of it before their local churches. We will defer stressing the publicity of the other two acts typed in vs. 11 and 13 until we come to them in the discussion of these verses; but we here remark that they also were very publicly performed in both the type and antitype.

(36) Two important items are brought to our attention in v. 10. The first of these tells us that Moses was charged to bring, present, the Levites before the Lord. There are some who use the expression, "to present one before the Lord," to mean, to bring one into such a presence of God as is in heaven, where God is, and, as it were, into the throne room of Jehovah. This is the view that The Tower advocated on Job 1: 6; 2: 1, in an attempt to prove that Satan remained in heaven as a member of Jehovah's Court until 1914, when he was said to have been cast out of heaven. Since God sees everything and everyone, all things are

in His presence, no matter where they are; and, therefore, one need not be in Jehovah's throne room, in heaven itself, to be in His presence. That the expression does not have such a meaning in these passages of Job is evident from Lev. 16: 7; 1 Sam. 10: 19; Lev. 4: 15, 18; 8: 27; 14: 11; Num. 7: 3; 14: 37; 17: 7; Deut. 1: 45; 4: 10; Josh. 6: 8; 1 Sam. 1: 12; 2 Sam. 6: 5; etc., etc. In the foregoing passages and very many others the expression, to do this or that before the Lord, means to do something pertaining to Divine matters, under the Lord's special notice. And certainly that is the thought in v. 10. Certainly the Levites in the type were not brought before the Lord in the sense of being taken to heaven, even into Jehovah's throne room; but it was (v. 10) in connection with doing certain matters pertaining to God, under His special notice. And this certainly is true of the antitypical Levites. In their being brought to justification they were not taken to heaven into God's throne room; but they entered into doing certain things pertaining to God, under His direct notice. In their undergoing preparation for Levitical service after their faith justification they were also engaged in certain things pertaining to God, under His direct notice. In their being installed into their official work as Gospel-Age Levites, they certainly have been engaged in matters pertaining to God, under His direct attention. And, finally, in the performance of their Levitical service for God's Priests and people of the Gospel-Age, they certainly have been engaged in Divine matters, under God's direct notice. Accordingly, we understand that the charge that Moses bring the Levites before the Lord, types God's charge to our Lord to bring the faith-justified forward in a service pertinent to Divine matters, under the Lord's direct notice.

(37) The second item of which v. 10 treats is the Israelites' putting their hands on the Levites. In the Bible, the symbolic use of the expression, to lay hands

on a person or thing has three meanings: One of these is *representation.* Thus when Aaron and his sons laid their hands on the bullock in the consecration service (Lev. 8: 14), the act symbolized that the bullock stood for them, typical of how at the consecration of Jesus and the Church, their humanity stood for them. Again, when Aaron laid his hands on Azazel's goat (Lev. 16: 21), he thereby symbolized how that goat was a representation of him from a certain standpoint, typical of how when the World's High Priest began to deal with the antitypical Goat of Azazel, the humanity of the crown-losers was still part of the World's High Priest. These two illustrations sufficiently prove that to lay hands on a person or thing, among other things symbolizes *representation.* Furthermore, this expression symbolizes *the bestowal of a power or gift.* This is apparent from the fact that the gifts of the Spirit were symbolically bestowed by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, as can be seen from the acts of Peter and John at Samaria (Acts 8: 15-24), of the company of the Apostles with Timothy (1 Tim. 4: 14), of Paul with Timothy (2 Tim. 1: 6) and of the doctrine as such (Heb. 6: 2). Then, too, this expression is Biblically used to represent *sanction*, *endorsement*, *recommendation*, *vouching for*, *standing good for*, as can be seen from 1 Tim. 5: 22.

(38) In which of these three senses does v. 10 use this expression as descriptive of the Israelites' acts with the Levites, as these acts are set forth in this verse? Evidently not in the first sense, because the Levites were not made the representatives or substitutes for the Israelites, though in a sense Aaron's bullock was such in the day of atonement service. But this is not anywhere set forth by the symbolic act of laying on of hands, nor could that act have been performed in harmony with the atonement-day picture. Again, this expression cannot mean the act of conferring the gifts of the Spirit; for nobody, apart from God and Christ,

except an Apostle, could confer those gifts; and the time for the conferring of them could not come until, after His resurrection, Christ had first ascended into heaven (Acts 1: 7; 2: 4, 12, 16, 33; Eph. 4: 7, 8). This leaves the third meaning for application here—*sanction, recommendation, vouching for, endorsement, standing good for*. Accordingly, by laying (literally, *leaning*) their hands on the Levites, the Israelites symbolized their endorsement of the Levites for their official work. This types how during the Gospel-Age the nominal people of God have endorsed the prospective and real faith-justified in the antitypical cleansing and consecrating for antitypical Leviteship. Thus the nominal people of God have endorsed the prospective faith-justified, when they exercised faith unto justification. They did the same when they made their public confession, whether this was by confirmation or by the less formal way of informing the assembled congregation of their experience or of joining the church as practiced among non-ritualistic churches. All of us recall how our course in the above stages was approved by the church members, who showed their endorsement by handshaking, by offering congratulations and by smiles and other looks, words and acts of approval, as well as often by voting the pertinent persons into church membership, in the local ecclesia.

(39) Furthermore, such endorsement was shown in subsequent stages of the antitypical Levite's consecration for Levite work. One of the stages was the preparatory or training stage. As we have learned, the Gershonite Levites represent those antitypical Levites (1) who helped people to justification (Libnites) and (2) who helped some to consecration (Shimites). To perform the first of such works, one would do evangelistic work, which was done by professional evangelists or evangelically working pastors or catechists, or lay workers, like Sunday-school teachers and superintendents, lay preachers, elders, class leaders or unofficial

church members. But to do such work properly one would have to undergo preparation. Sometimes this would be at theological seminaries, sometimes at missionary and evangelistic training schools, sometimes in the "school of experience." And the nominal people of God endorsed them in such preparation. Sometimes this was done by their financial support of such schools and of their students, sometimes by their praising and encouraging them during their period of preparation, and sometimes by holding them up as examples worthy of others' imitation. And, finally, they gave their endorsement by their electing and arranging for such antitypical Levites to be inducted into their office as such. This, *e.g.*, can plainly be seen in the election and installation of Levites as pastors, evangelists, missionaries, catechists, Sunday School teachers, superintendents, lay preachers, etc., etc. The nominal church members, as a rule, voted their approval on such and in various other ways showed that they endorsed them for the antitypical Libnite Gershonite work to which they were chosen. They did the same to the Shimite Gershonites. These occupied themselves with leading people to consecrate, and thus they supplied new priests. As this work was done usually by pastors through special services, individual pastoral ministries and books, we see the antitypical Israelites endorsing these in such work by attendance on and financial support of such meetings, by financial support of such pastors in such work, in circulating the pertinent books and helping their writers in ways similar to those ways of supporting the antitypical Kohathite writers mentioned below. In all this they laid their hands on them.

(40) Above we illustrated how nominal antitypical Israel laid their hands on the Gershonite Levites. They did the same with the antitypical Merarite Levites. Their Mushite branch consisted of publishers of Bibles, and books, magazines and tracts on the Bible, together with their helpers. Their Mahlite branch consisted of

the editors and proofreaders of such literature, *i.e.*, those who saw such publications through the press and supplied notes, prefaces, made corrections, etc., for them. The publishers of such literature, and their helpers were endorsed for such activities by word of mouth, by financial patronage and contributions and, in the case of denominational publishers, by election or appointment through the nominal people of God. Similarly did the nominal people of God act toward the Mahlite Merarites, the editors and their helpers. Nominal antitypical Israel endorsed the Kohathite Levites also. These are the scholars who have written: linguistic (Amramite), exegetical (Izeharite), historical (Hebronite) and systematic (Uzzielite) treatises on Biblical and Church and pertinent secular matters, or delivered lectures on such matters from the four standpoints just mentioned. These in their activities have also been endorsed by the antitypical Israelites, sometimes by financial help enabling them to support themselves while prosecuting the pertinent studies, favoring them with library facilities, buying, selling and recommending their books, supporting their lectures, etc., and in general encouraging them in their work. Thus we see how the antitypical Israelites laid their hands on the antitypical Levites at all stages of their Leviteship and how they did this with the eight main subdivisions of them. The facts corroborate our thought.

(41) The matters discussed in the preceding eight paragraphs put us in a position to note that what comes between vs. 8 and 12 is properly placed; because while some of the features of each of these verses reach forward to happenings coming beyond v. 12, in all of them there is a reaching backward to things in v. 8. It is doubtless this preponderance of things in vs. 9 and 10 referring to matters related to things discussed in v. 8 that prompted the Lord to put vs. 9 and 10 where He did in relation to the other matters discussed in this chapter. Doubtless another reason for so ordering the

subject matter of vs. 9 and 10 is that, placed where they are, they help to clearness of understanding of the antitypes. Certainly the study of Num. 8: 5-10 enhances in our estimation the pertinent types as prophecies "of good things to come," which is doubtless one of the reasons why God graciously blesses us with this enlightenment.

(42) We now come to the consideration of v. 11. As the margin indicates, the translation should be "And Aaron shall wave the Levites as a wave-offering before the Lord from the children of Israel, that they may be [fitted] to execute the service of the Lord." In paragraph (24) we should have brought out the significance of the wave-and heave-offerings; we will, therefore, do it here. In T 45, par. 2, the wave-offering of the priests' consecration is shown to represent the continuity of the sacrifice of the Christ, in that they persevere in consecration to keep their affections and powers uplifted even unto death in the Lord's service. The heave-offering of the Christ represents that the sacrifice of the Christ is given to God to exalt His holy name. In this verse, not the wave-offering of the Christ is typed, but that which Jesus makes of the Gospel-Age Levites as from the antitypical children of Israel. It will be noticed that in v. 13 *Moses* is said to make a wave-offering of the Levites. This shows that at least two wavings were made in the type, and we are to look for at least two distinct things as corresponding to them in the antitype. Careful consideration shows that there are at least two such wavings. In the type the first of these is set forth before the justification of the Levites is set forth, which, as we shall see, is shown in v. 12. We have seen that vs. 9-11 were inserted between vs. 8 and 12 in order to bring out some things which, in part at least, occur in the antitype before certain things in the antitype of v. 8 occur, though some of these things also come antitypically after the antitype of v. 12 sets in. Most of the things referred to in v. 11

occur antitypically after the antitype of v. 12 occurs. Yet some of them occur before this; hence the entire subject is, as in the case of the subject matter of vs. 9 and 10, introduced before the type of v. 12 is set forth. This will appear when the antitype of v. 11 is made clear to us.

(43) What, then, is the antitype of Aaron's waving the Levites as a wave-offering from the children of Israel before the Lord? In this type, of course, Aaron represents our Lord as High Priest. The waving of the Levites seems to type the long-drawn-out preparation that is intended to fit the antitypical Levites for the service of the Lord. Its being done "before the Lord" indicates that the service was connected with Divine matters under Jehovah's direct attention. The purpose of this wave-offering is stated as follows: "that they may be [fitted] to execute the service of the Lord." This is evidently a different thing from that which Moses (v. 13) did in waving the Levites, as the last feature of their consecration. The fact that the purpose of it is stated as follows: "that they may be to execute the service of the Lord," the fact that a long-drawn-out preparation has been needed to fit the antitypical Levites for their service, and the final fact that nowhere would this be referred to in the type unless in v. 11, moves us to understand that Aaron's waving them types the long preparation that our Lord gives the antitypical Levites for their service. That they are waved by our Lord as a wave-offering of the antitypical children of Israel, implies that the nominal people of God in the Gospel-Age have been active continually in helping them in their preparation for the Levitical work of the Gospel-Age, a thing shown above.

(44) A consideration of the pertinent facts will make the various features of v. 11 antitypically clear. The preparation of the Gospel-Age Levites has been one of head and heart; and it had its beginning in both respects in the antitypes of v. 8; for the Truth explanations

and promises, typed by the three sacrifices of v. 8, gave them intellectual equipment for their later work. So, too, those truths wrought something of hope and love, and more particularly of faith, in them, which was also a partial heart preparation for their later Levitical service. It is because of the preparatory force of the antitypes of v. 8 that we remarked above that part of the preparation typed by v. 11 was implied as beginning in v. 8; and for this reason v. 11, like vs. 9 and 10, is put before v. 12, where the exercising of faith and the justification of the repentant and believing sinner are set forth typically. Some more of such preparatory work is implied in the publicity of the antitypical acts as typed in v. 9. And still more of such preparatory work is implied in the antitypes of v. 10; for their being made participants in Divine matters under God's direct attention and under the approval of the nominal people of God, prepared them still further for their future Levitical work. Accordingly, we find that, like the thoughts of vs. 9 and 10, those of v. 11 are rightly placed in the chapter under study.

(45) But the main preparation of the antitypical Levites comes to them, both in head and heart, after the antitype of v. 12 sets in, *i.e.*, after a justifying faith is wrought and, as a consequence, justification by faith is effected. This preparation differs somewhat in the three groups of Gospel-Age Levites and also in their eight subdivisions. In all of them the heart's preparation includes their increasingly overcoming human faults, *i.e.*, the human depravities, sins, and their increasingly developing the virtues of the natural man. And we rejoice to recognize that some considerable progress was made by them in a righteous life adorned with human virtues. This phase of their development continued in them for the years of their Leviteship and, of course, made their ministry more acceptable and fruitful in all the phases of their service. And when it became the chief concern of any one of them, it led him

to consecrate himself, thus introducing him into priesthood. But in so far as this feature of the preparation was Levitical it did not imply giving up natural selfishness and worldliness and developing disinterested love, in itself and in its relation to the other graces; it only implied giving up sinful selfishness and worldliness and cultivating duty-love Godward and manward, in itself and in its relation to the other natural virtues. The higher the form of the Levitical service, the higher was the pertinent preparation in the conjoined Levitical virtues. We can see this as we contemplate the various Levites in these varying services: Sunday-school workers, lay preachers, catechists, evangelists, preachers, pastors, publishers, editors of works and scholarly writers and lecturers.

(46) The foregoing preparation was mainly an internal one and, therefore, was not very palpable to outward sense as a process, but quite palpable as a result and attainment. The clearest expression of the Levitical preparation is that which applied to the head—the intellectual preparation. As to that of the antitypical Gershonites who became pastors, as a rule it implied quite a long-drawn-out matter. As a rule, both the antitypical Libnite and Shimite Gershonites went through a careful college and seminary training. As a rule, in the college this implied the classical course, in which usually Latin, Greek and Hebrew, as well as the native tongue of the student, were cultivated, and other more or less related secular branches were studied. In the seminary the various branches of linguistic, systematic, exegetical, historical and practical theology were studied. Thus they there studied the Scriptures in the Greek and Hebrew (linguistic theology); dogmatics, apologetics and ethics in systematic theology; isogogics, interpretation and harmonetics in exegetical theology; Bible history and biography, church history and biography, sacred archeology, geography and chronology in historical theology, and liturgics, evangelistics,

homiletics, catechetics, hermeneutics and poimetics in practical theology, with opportunities of exercising themselves in the application of their knowledge in practice as evangelists, preachers, catechists and pastors, especially during their vacations before entering the ministry. In countries where there were no seminaries, *e.g.*, during the earlier Colonial period in America, prospective preachers would study under the supervision of some competent minister. Frequently missionaries would be additionally trained in special missionary schools after completing their seminary course, while in other cases they were sent directly from the seminary to the mission field, and in some cases their seminary course was limited to the mission schools. In the case of Sunday-school workers, lay preachers and evangelists, usually individual effort in the school of experience was their preparation. Usually local conferences and synods, as well as individual training, were the schools where pastors were educated in the ways of antitypical Shimite Gershonites, *i.e.*, leaders of others into consecration. But whether by one method or another, a long-drawn-out preparation was undergone by the antitypical Gershonites, and the continuity of this preparation is typed by Aaron waving the Levites as a wave-offering before the Lord; and the nominal people of God giving such for, and supporting them in this work, is indicated in the Levites being given as a wave-offering from the children of Israel for God and the Priesthood.

(47) The antitypical Merarites likewise were by our Lord waved as a wave-offering from antitypical Israel. For the publishers this implied a careful business training in general and in publishing work in particular. They had to learn much of the art of printing and planning the publication and circulation of Bibles and other religious books, as well as of magazines and tracts. This required, as a rule, at least a long-drawn-out clerkship in a publishing house; often it implied

the learning of the printer's trade and a position in the office of a publishing firm. Thus were the antitypical Mushite Merarites waved by our Lord as a wave-offering from antitypical Israel before the Lord. Similarly were the antitypical Mahlite Merarites given preparatory training for their editing work. Their editing the writings of various authors sometimes required a high degree of scholarship in them. Hence, as a rule, these were college and university graduates. Some of them as such have prepared notes that are as valuable as the books in which they appear as notes. Sometimes their introductions and appendices to, and indices of the works that they edited, give special value to such works. And, of course, a long period of training was necessary to fit them to do such work. Even those antitypical Mahlites who have been only proofreaders have frequently had a good education to do their work properly, and their being given such education was their waving by our Lord as a wave-offering from antitypical Israel before the Lord.

(48) The Gospel-Age Kohathites had to undergo the most careful training of all its Levites because of the character of their work. In most cases the Gospel-Age Kohathites have been Gospel-Age Gershonites as well, and in a few cases Gospel-Age Merarites, especially of the Mahlite branch. Noted exceptions to these usually having been Gospel-Age Gershonites were Edward Robinson, one of the ablest Kohathites of the 19th century, and James Strong, only a little less fruitful as a Kohathite, both of whom were laymen, and both of whom, however, were theological professors. Accordingly, the Gospel-Age Kohathites, as a rule, had the training mentioned above as undergone by the Gershonites. Additionally they underwent a very specialized training, enabling them to qualify for their specific Gospel-Age Kohathite work. Those who furnished linguistic helps in the way of Greek and Hebrew recensions of the New and Old Testaments, or Greek and

Hebrew dictionaries, grammars or concordances, or Bible translations and vernacular concordances, had to undergo a very intricate and detailed training to fit them for their work. The same thing is true of the scientific exegetes on Biblical matters. Careful, specialized and learned training did the Biblical and ecclesiastical historians, biographers, archeologians, geographers and chronologians have to undergo, as also did the systematic theologians in their dogmatical, apologetical and ethical works. In the preparation that the Gospel-Age Kohathites had to undergo we witness the most individual preparatory work manifested; for evidently their work was too technical and minute to be given in schools. It could come only by individual study, partly originally undertaken and partly done from books of other Kohathites and of priests, crown-losers, etc. Accordingly, the Gospel-Age Kohathites have been the specialists, the experts and the scholars among the Levites. Their long-drawn-out preparation for their work was the antitype of the Kohathites being made wave-offerings. Our Lord's part in such preparation was typed by Aaron waving the Kohathite Levites and the nominal people of God furnishing them and helping them for this purpose was typed by the Kohathites being furnished and helped by the Israelites. And this being done in Divine matters, under Jehovah's direct attention, was typed by the waving of the Kohathites *before the Lord.* And all this antitypical waving for all three groups of the antitypical Levites was "that they might be to execute the service of the Lord."

(49) We now come to the discussion of v. 12, which is perhaps the richest in contents of all the verses of Num. 8; for in very few words it gives us a wonderful typical description of all of the features of the acts embraced in justification by faith. We have already sufficiently proved that it is properly placed in the chapter, showing how vs. 9-11 properly come between it and v. 8, which at first thought we would naturally

conclude it should follow. The first clause of this verse reads: "And the Levites shall lean their hands upon the heads of the bullocks." This action represents, so far as the bullock of the sin-offering is concerned, faith leaning on, relying upon, reposing upon, Jesus as the substitute of believing sinners in death as a sin-offering. The Bible clearly teaches that Jesus became the sinner's substitute in death (Is. 53: 4-12; Dan. 9: 26; Matt. 26: 28; John 1: 29; 6: 51; 10: 11, 15; 11: 50-52; Rom. 3: 24-26; 4: 25; 5: 6-21; 8: 3, 4; 14: 15; 1 Cor. 8: 11; 15: 3; 2 Cor. 5: 14, 18-21; Gal. 1: 4; 4: 4, 5; Eph. 1: 7; 2: 13-16; 5: 2, 25; Col. 1: 20-22; 1 Thes. 5: 9, 10; 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6; Heb. 2: 6-9; 9: 12-15, 28; 10: 4-9, 12; 13: 12; 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19; 2: 21, 24; 3: 18; 4: 1; 1 John 2: 2; 3: 5, 16; 4: 10; Rev. 5: 9). In the foregoing citations two kinds of passages are quoted: those that directly teach that Jesus as a human being became our substitute, and those that impliedly teach it by showing that He died for us. How He died for us, *i.e.*, in our interests, is shown in those passages that tell us that He suffered in our stead, *i.e.*, as our substitute. Hence by dying as our substitute He died for us, in our interests. And in v. 12 the idea of His substitution for us is brought out typically by the Levites' leaning their hands *on the bullock of the sin-offering*.

(50) But their *leaning* their hands on the bullock of the sin-offering types *faith relying* on Christ as such a substitute. We have seen how laying on of hands symbolizes representation, standing for another. The idea of substitution is a phase of representation and is the one here indicated; for according to the Scriptures it is in the sense of substitution that Christ is our representative in death. This being so, laying hands on a substitute implies acceptance of him as such; hence the Levites' laying hands on the bullock of the sin-offering types that the faith-justified accept Jesus' humanity, the sin-offering, as their substitute as such, *i.e.*, rely upon His death for sin as substituted for their death for sin.

The exercise of faith in Christ's death as an acceptable sacrifice before God for the believer's sins is, therefore, the thing typified by the Levites' leaning their hands on the bullock of the sin-offering. Their leaning their hands on the bullock of the burnt-offering types the faith-justified as exercising faith, reliance, on God's manifested acceptance of Christ's sacrifice as a substitute for them in death. This means that they believe that God accepts the Substitute's death for the forgiveness of their sins, the Substitute's fulfillment of the Law as their righteousness and that peace between them and God results from their forgiveness and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to them. These are the antitypes of the Levites' leaning their hands on the bullock of the sin-offering and the bullock of the burnt-offering.

(51) The expression, *shall lean*, which is the literal meaning of the word translated, *shall lay*, is meaningful in this connection. Faith is, more than any other quality, the hand of the heart, because of its supreme energizing power in a faith dispensation. While love is and forever will be greater than faith; faith, in a faith dispensation, is more important than love; because it is the foundation of all our relations toward the Lord in wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and deliverance. And in justification, especially its leaning, relying, character is prominent. Properly has our Pastor defined it as mental appreciation and heart's reliance (Heb. 11: 1; Hab. 2: 4; Matt. 6: 25-34). As typed by v. 8, it comes from hearing God's Word (Acts 15: 7; Rom. 10: 13-17; 1 Cor. 1: 21; Gal. 3: 1, 2; 1 Thes. 2: 13; John 1: 7; 3: 11, 12; Acts 2: 40-42). Its basis is mental appreciation, whereby one has knowledge, understanding and belief with respect to matters of faith; and its superstructure is heart's reliance, whereby one trusts, appropriates and acts responsively as to matters of faith (John 3: 36; Rom. 10: 14; 4: 18-21; Heb. 11: 1, 13). A justifying faith exercises these two

features—mental appreciation and heart's reliance—in Christ as an acceptable sin-offering (John 3: 14-18; Rom. 1: 16; 10: 6-10; 1 Cor. 15: 3; Gal. 3: 13, 22; Heb. 9: 14, 15; 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19; 1 John 2: 1, 2; 4: 10). It also exercises these two features toward God as the Forgiver of one's sins for the sake of Christ's merit (Luke 24: 47; Acts 2: 38; 10: 36; 13: 38, 39; Rom. 3: 24-26; Rom. 4: 3-8; Eph. 4: 32; Heb. 9: 22; 1 John 1: 7, 9; Rev. 1: 5). It likewise exercises these two features toward God as the Imputer of Christ's righteousness to the believer (Rom. 3: 20-26; 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Gal. 2: 16; 3: 22; Phil. 3: 9; 2 Cor. 5: 21; 1 John 2: 1). And, finally, it exercises these two features as to peace with God (Acts 10: 36; Rom. 5: 1; Eph. 2: 14-17; Phil. 4: 9; Col. 1: 20). Therefore faith not only exercises mental appreciation and heart's reliance in Christ as an acceptable sin-offering, but also in God as being, for Christ's merit, the Forgiver of the believer's sins, the Imputer to him of Christ's righteousness and the Peace-Giver to, and Peace-Receiver from the believer. All of this is typed by the Levites' leaning their hands on the two bullocks, as set forth in v. 12.

(52) The next thought brought to our attention is the charge that Moses should offer one of the bullocks as a sin-offering and the other as a burnt-offering to God, in order to make atonement for the Levites. We would naturally expect that Aaron, as high priest, would have been charged to offer the sin-and burnt-offerings, to make an atonement for the Levites. Yet the text tells us that Moses was the one so charged. But we notice that in v. 21 Aaron is said to have made the atonement for them. How are we to harmonize these things? So far as the type is concerned, we would say that both acted together in offering the sin-and burnt-offerings; and, so far as the antitype is concerned, our Lord as the antitype of both acted as God's Executive (antitypical Moses) and as High Priest (antitype of Aaron). The reason, therefore, in the

antitype is to bring out both the executive and high-priestly actions involved in the antitype, *i.e.*, Jesus in the antitype acted as God's Executive in so far as what He did served to carry forward God's plan, and as High Priest in so far as what He did worked reconciliation in God toward the believer. These considerations are a further proof of the thought that Moses in Numbers, as a rule, types our Lord as Jehovah's Executive, while Aaron there, as a rule, types Him as High Priest. They also show that these two official capacities of our Lord not infrequently unitedly work in some features of God's plan.

(53) We are not to understand that the offering of the bullock of the sin-offering as set forth in v. 12 types our Lord's sacrificing Himself from Jordan to Calvary; because the offering of the sin-offering in v. 12 is, both in the type and in the antitype, subsequent to the typical and antitypical Levites' laying their hands respectively upon the typical and antitypical bullocks, which means, so far as the antitype is concerned, after the repentant sinner exercises faith in Christ as an acceptable sin-offering—substitute—for the sinner. Furthermore, we know that Christ's sacrifice from Jordan to Calvary preceded the sinner's exercise both of repentance and faith; hence it cannot be typed in the statement of v. 12. What, then, does Moses' and Aaron's offering of the sin-offering to God type? We reply, it types Christ's reckonedly imputing His perfect humanity, His human right to life and its conjoined life-rights, on behalf of repentant and believing sinners. This use of the word *offering* occurs in Heb. 10: 14 in relation to our Lord's actually imputing His merit, effecting vitalized justification in part. This offering of v. 12, then, types, not acts done on earth, but acts done in heaven (Heb. 9: 24). The reasons just given prove this view of the matter to be correct. This fact enables us to see all the more clearly the truthfulness of our dear Pastor's later distinctions as to the

pertinent matters. In his earlier ministry he taught that the ransom was paid, the atonement Godward was completed, at Calvary; but later on he correctly taught that at Calvary the ransom price was only deposited (Luke 23: 46), and that only after Jesus appeared in heaven (Heb. 9: 24) did He use the price for an actual imputative purchase—a credit loan—of the Church; and so far as the faith-justified are concerned, as a reckoned imputative purchase of them. It is of this reckoned imputative purchase that our texts treats; and it is another strong typical proof of the Biblical teaching of a tentative justification as operative during the Gospel-Age. How beautifully in the typology of this verse, in so far as it treats of the offering of the bullock of the sin-offering to God, is this truth hidden! We thank God for this and every other assurance of the correctness of our faith, as taught by that Servant.

(54) Certainly, the Bible teaches tentative justification (Rom. 4: 1-12). The Ancient Worthies (Heb. 11: 7; Rom. 4: 18-22), the Youthful Worthies, the immature children of the consecrated (1 Cor. 7: 14) and Gospel-Age unconsecrated believers (Rom. 10: 4; 4: 5; Acts 13: 38, 39), certainly are illustrations. of tentatively justified persons; for the tentatively justified are such as do not have an actual imputation of Christ's merit made on their behalf, though God temporarily treats them as though such was done on their behalf. Certainly, the merit of Christ could not have been actually imputed before it was deposited at Calvary. Hence the Ancient Worthies could not have had more than a reckoned imputation of that merit. Of course, the Youthful Worthies must fare like them. Very evidently, the same is true of the immature children of the consecrated. In Rom. 4: 3-8 St. Paul gives Abraham and David as illustrations of a justification operative during the Gospel-Age; and as their justification was without an actual imputation of Christ's merit, of necessity those of the Gospel-Age who have had exactly

the same kind of a justification as the Ancient Worthies, must have had a tentative justification—one wrought, not by an actual, but by a reckoned imputation of Christ's merit; for be it remembered that the difference between tentative and vitalized justification, so far as God's and Christ's activities therein are concerned, consists in this: that in tentative justification God and Christ do not actually, but only reckonedly impute Jesus' merit on behalf of the believer, while in vitalized justification they actually impute Jesus' merit on behalf of the consecrated believer. But the Bible just as emphatically teaches a vitalized justification—that which was experienced when a justified believer so thoroughly believed as to consecrate himself, and when God was about to give him the Spirit-begettal (1 Cor. 6: 11; Heb. 10: 14; 9: 24; 1 John 2: 2; Jas. 2: 17-26). Such a consecrating faith is brought out in the Greek by the expression, *Pisteuein eis*, *i.e.*, to believe into (John 3: 15, 16, 18, 36; 7: 5, 31, 38, 39, 48; Acts 10: 43; 14: 23; 19: 4; Rom. 10: 14; Gal. 2: 16; 1 Pet. 1: 21; 1 John 5: 10, 13); while a justifying faith as distinct from a consecrating faith is brought out in the Greek by the expression, *pisteuein epi*, to believe on, or upon (Luke 24: 25; Acts 9: 42; 11: 17; 16: 31; 22: 19; Rom. 4: 5, 24; 1 Tim. 1: 16).

(55) Both tentative justification and vitalized justification are acts performed in heaven (Heb. 9: 24). While the passage just cited, strictly speaking, refers to vitalized and not to tentative justification, it teaches that in heaven is the place where justification is performed; and it therefore implies that there is where tentative justification is performed. And that which is implied in Heb. 9: 24 is directly taught in Rom. 3: 25, 22. In v. 25 Christ in His being righteousness for the believer is called the antitypical Mercy Seat—a thing that is in the antitypical Holy of Holies—heaven—whereas in v. 22 He is set forth as the righteousness of all believers—hence for justified, as well as for consecrated

believers. Accordingly, both kinds of justification are performed in heaven. According to Heb. 1: 3 our Lord made a general imputation of His merit for the entire Church as a class on His ascending to heaven, as a thing making operative the Gospel-Age salvation. But this did not affect individuals as such until individually they availed themselves of it tentatively, by a justifying faith, when Jesus made a reckoned imputation of His merit for them as individuals, and vitalizedly by a consecrating faith, when Jesus made an actual imputation of His merit for them as individuals. In other words, the general imputation at Pentecost was made for the class, while the individual imputations were made for each one as he exercised the pertinent faith (Rom. 3: 22-26; 10: 4, 10). The distinction here is somewhat like the one in election: Before the world was created the class was elected (Eph. 1: 4), but the individuals have been selected during the Gospel-Age at their Spirit-begetting (2 Thes. 2: 13). Additionally, whenever we sin after our tentative justification or vitalized justification and make proper request for forgiveness Jesus tentatively or vitalizedly makes the pertinent imputation for our forgiveness and covers us with His righteousness (1 John 2: 1, 2). This phase of the imputations for the Gospel-Age Levites is likewise implied typically by Moses' offering the bullock of the sin-offering, in v. 12.

(56) How has the antitypical Moses made these reckoned imputations? We understand the matter as follows: It was, of course, Jesus who wrought repentance through the preaching of the Law, and faith through the preaching of the justification features of the Gospel, in the Gospel-Age Levites. These began to long for forgiveness while they were in the process of repentance and asked for it; but it was only by heartily accepting the preaching of the justification features of the Gospel that they came to a justifying faith—a faith that believes heartily that God for the

merit of Christ forgives the sinner his sins, imputes to him Christ's righteousness and enters into peace with him. The moment such a faith was wrought in the heart of a repentant sinner, Jesus indicated to the Father that He was reckonedly (not actually) imputing His merit on his behalf; and therefore God reckonedly (not actually) forgave him his sins and reckonedly (not actually) imputed to him Christ's righteousness, and on that account entered into a reckoned peace with him. It is because all four of these acts were reckoned and not actual that the faith-justified are tentatively, not vitalizedly, justified. Again, when after their original experience of tentative justification, the Gospel-Age Levites have sinned and then repented and believed that Christ imputed His merit to cover that sin and that God accepted it for him, Jesus made the necessary reckoned imputation *for* such repentant believers and God made the necessary reckoned imputation *to* them. Thus He has been the continued Preserver of their tentative justification, as God has been its continued Maker.

(57) How has our Lord been making the actual imputations during the Gospel-Age, *i.e.*, how has He, in distinction from tentative justification, been vitalizing the justification of believers? We answer that after He by the Word had wrought in responsive hearts a consecrating faith and love, and thereby had enabled them to make an entire consecration of themselves to God, when God was ready to accept their consecration, our Lord appeared before the Father (Heb. 9: 24) and made an actual imputation of His merit with the Father on their behalf. According to an understanding between the Father and Him He let go, so far as tentatively reckoning is concerned, of all further hold on the amount of His merit needed to bring the consecrated believer up to perfection by actually imputing it before God for that believer; and that actually enabled the Father, in harmony with His plan, to forgive this

pertinent consecrated believer, actually to impute to him Christ's righteousness and actually to enter into peace with him. This actually forever freed the pertinent believer from the Adamic sentence, as well as from the condemnation of his own actual Adamic sins, and actually counted him perfect in righteousness (Heb. 10: 14). Henceforth, it is impossible for him to die in Adam, *i.e.*, die the Adamic death. Moreover, any sins of weakness or ignorance that he may thereafter commit are forgiven and covered with righteousness on his exercising repentance and faith as to it; for thereupon our blessed Advocate (1 John 2: 1, 2) actually imputes on his behalf before the Father the required merit for his forgiveness and perfection in righteousness; and as a consequence God actually imputes this to him, whereby he is forgiven, is reckonedly brought up to human perfection and is at peace with God as respects those sins. If it were not for this gracious provision of the Lord on our behalf, we would all long ago have irretrievably fallen; but by it we can stand and win out in the high calling by grace Divine. Praise Jehovah for such a Savior! While vitalized justification is not referred to in v. 12, for it is not experienced by the Gospel-Age Levites, it is yet well for the sake of clearness and completeness to consider it in this connection, which accounts for our introducing it here.

(58) But v. 12 not only charges Moses to offer the sin-offering. It also charges him to offer the burnt-offering. This types, in His offering of the sin-offering, that our Lord was charged to impute His merit reckonedly on behalf of the repentant believer; and it types, in His offering of the burnt-offering, something that our Lord does connected with God's forgiving the believer, imputes to him Christ's righteousness and takes him into peace with Him. In paragraph (53) we saw that Moses' (v. 12) offering the sin-offering does not type our Lord's sacrificing Himself from Jordan

to Calvary, but His reckonedly imputing the merit of that sacrifice in heaven for the Gospel-Age Levites. So, also, we recognize that His offering the burnt-offering does not type God's personally manifesting His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice; for God acts in that manifestation, *i.e.*, by forgiveness, by imputation of Christ's righteousness to the sinner and by drawing him into peace with Him. While the burnt-offering represents these acts as God's manifested acceptance of the sin-offering, the offering of the burnt-offering *by Moses* types a work that our Lord does as to that manifested acceptance before, during and after the repentant sinner comes to faith. What, then, does Moses' offering the burnt-offering type? It would seem to be those services of Jesus on working a justifying faith in the repentant sinner, peace with God, an increase of knowledge and righteousness and incitements toward consecration in the justified, as evidences that God has accepted His sacrifice for each individual who experiences faith-justification. And He works these things in them as often as their experiences call for them. All of these acts He performed through the Word, backed by suitable providences. And thereby He has been offering the burnt-offering for the Gospel-Age Levites.

(59) As we who are consecrated look back at our experiences with Christ's offering His burnt-offering (understood as just explained) in relation to us as justified believers, we can all testify that He did perform such a ministry on us by the pertinent teachings of the Lord's Word and by varied experiences into which He brought us. These teachings He ministered to us by pastors, by Sunday-school teachers and superintendents, by more or less other mature believers, by testimonies of others, by conversations and by reading pertinent books, especially the Bible. Doubtless all of us can recall such teachings; and our memories dwell with more or less fondness upon them. And, doubtless, we can all recall how by these our faith in the pertinent

pre-justification acts of God and Christ was developed; our faith in the justification acts of God and Christ, *i.e.*, in our being forgiven, in our being clothed in Christ's righteousness and in our having peace with God, was sustained, increased, confirmed and completed; as also thereby our peace, joy and righteousness were increased. Doubtless all of us can recall various experiences that contributed to the same result. Sometimes our meeting with a fine Christian character or worker providentially proved refreshing. Sometimes an opportunity of helping a sinner toward repentance and faith strengthened our faith. Sometimes the fellowship of kindred souls, especially after "rubbing up" with the world, gave us a boost in our justified life. Sometimes a successful effort in service proved a stimulus to our confidence. Sometimes a rebuke or correction or encouragement was providentially used to strengthen a faltering faith. Sometimes a sore affliction or disappointment or loss or fault proved to be the providential experience needed to bring us closer to the Lord in our justification blessings. Whatever the experience was, whether toward or untoward, it was our faithful, loving Lord who manipulated it into our lives in order to preserve, increase, confirm and complete our faith in our forgiveness and possession of Christ's righteousness and peace with God. Thus our dear Savior in His faithfulness and untiring devotion to us while we were proceeding toward justification and while we were no more advanced than Gospel-Age Levites, ministered on our behalf and by so doing *offered* the burnt-offering for us as Gospel-Age Levites, even as He has done for all the others of the same class.

(60) The last clause of v. 12 tells of the effect to be wrought by Moses' offering the sin-offering and the burnt-offering. They were to effect an atonement for the Levites. This types the atoning effect of our Lord's sin-offering and burnt-offering with respect to the Gospel-Age Levites. Our Lord is the Agent who works

reconciliation (Rom. 5: 10, 11; 2 Cor. 5: 18, 19; Eph. 2: 16; Col. 1: 20, 21). But God is the source of the work of reconciliation (2 Cor. 5: 18, 19; Col. 1: 20). The word *reconciliation* presupposes that two individuals or parties are at variance with one another; and it means that both are made pleased with one another, are made one with each other, *at-one-ed*. In this case it is God and the sinner who are at variance with one another, God being displeased with the sinner because of his sin, and the sinner being displeased with God for His justice and for His punishing sins against that justice. God as the source of atonement or reconciliation provided for every step of its outworking: (1) by carnating His Son; (2) by enabling Him to sacrifice unto death; (3) by raising Him from the dead; (4) by having Him impute tentatively for the justified, vitalizedly for the Church, His merit for pleasing God with them during the Gospel-Age; (5) by making the justified pleased with God's righteousness and the Church with His righteousness and holiness; (6) by having Him apply His merit for the world for pleasing God with them; and (7) by making the obedient of the world pleased with God. It will be seen that the points marked (1), (2) and (3) are the preparatory parts of the reconciliation work, while the points marked (4), (5), (6) and (7) are the actual parts of the reconciliation work; and point (2) is the meritorious foundation of pleasing God with all, shown in (4) and (6).

(61) Christ's death is the meritorious cause of reconciliation, at-one-ment (Rom. 5: 10; 2 Cor. 5: 18, 19; Eph. 2: 16; Col. 1: 20, 21). He cooperated in every one of the seven parts of the atonement above mentioned, passively in parts (1) and (3) and actively in the other five parts. In all seven of them He is God's Agent to effect the atonement. God and our Lord have been using human instruments to assist them in this work. These have been the apostles, prophets,

evangelists, pastors or teachers and non-official members of the true Church, as well as official and nonofficial members of the nominal church (2 Cor. 5: 1820). These remarks prepare us to see more clearly the antitype of the atonement work referred to in v. 12. By offering the antitypical bullock of the sin-offering of v. 12, *i.e.*, reckonedly imputing His merit on behalf of the Gospel-Age Levites, our Lord performed the pertinent work of part (4), *i.e.*, made God pleased with the Gospel-Age Levites; and by offering the bullock of the burnt-offering, *i.e.*, *ministering* to the Gospel-Age Levites by the Word and providence, a creation, sustenance, increase, confirmation and completion of their faith in God's having forgiven them, reckonedly imputed to them Christ's righteousness and drawn them into peace with Him and working in them more pertinent knowledge and righteousness, our Lord performed the pertinent work of part (5), *i.e.*, made the Gospel-Age Levites pleased with God. These two things, then, are the intended effects—the making of atonement—of our Lord's offering the antitypes of the sin-offering and the burnt-offering of v. 12. Surely our study of v. 12 has brought some wonderful truths to our attention. It completes the charges given to Moses covering the cleansing of the Levites.

(62) V. 13 gives the charges laid upon Moses for the consecration of the Levites. They consist of two things: (1) The one commanding Moses to cause them to stand before Aaron and his sons and (2) the one commanding Moses to wave them as a wave-offering before the Lord. The expression, to stand before one as an official, which is the use of the term here, means to make them serve him in an office (Num. 16: 9; Deut. 10: 8; Judges 20: 28; 1 Sam. 16: 22; 1 Kings 10: 8; 12: 6, 8; Prov. 22: 20; Jer. 35: 19; Dan. 1: 5, 19; Rev. 7: 9; 8: 2). Accordingly, the charge to Moses here is to induct the Levites into their office as servants of Aaron and his sons. This, of course, means a consecration

of them to serve the priesthood. The other charge, to wave them as a wave-offering unto or before the Lord, means a consecration of them to a continuous service of the Lord in which their powers were to be uplifted unto a completion for the Lord's service to His glory. No mention is here made of a charge to make them stand before the congregation of Israel (Num. 16: 9), because in so far as this involved a work on their behalf it is implied in the other two charges, and because they were not to be made subordinate to the congregation of Israel, as they were to God and the priesthood. In other words, their service of Israel was a form that their service of God and the priesthood assumed and was not as such an independent service of the congregation. And it was only after the consecration of the Levites to the Lord and to the Aaronic priesthood was completed that the Levites were fully constituted the sacred tribe; and hence only thereafter was it lawful in the type for the Levites to enter into the tabernacle to perform their service therein. Thus were the Levites separated, as described in vs. 6-13, from the children of Israel, and became the Lord's Levites, according to v. 14.

(63) The types of v. 13 have some remarkable antitypes, which we will now study. In v. 13, as elsewhere, Aaron represents our Lord as High Priest and Aaron's sons represent the Church as the under-priesthood, while Moses here, as in the rest of this chapter, represents our Lord as Jehovah's Executive. Moses, therefore, causing the Levites to stand before Aaron and his sons, types our Lord as Jehovah's Executive putting the Gospel-Age Levites into the Levitical office as official servants of the Gospel-Age Priesthood—Head and Body. This means that their office was to serve the Priesthood, and that they were by God given that office through executive acts of our Lord. Their service as such was typed (1) by the various services of the Gershonite Levites. Therefore they were as

Gospel-Age Gershonites to serve Jesus and the Church as Libnites by leading sinners to repentance and faith unto justification, and as Shimites by leading justified ones onward to consecration. Thereby they served the Priesthood in two ways: winning new Levites and also new Priests for the Christ class. Thus their being set before Jesus and the Church put them into the Gospel-Age Gershonite Levitical office, wherein they were made available to Jesus and the Church for these two services, wherein they stood ready to perform such services and wherein they stood ready to respond to the Priesthood's calling on them for such services.

(64) The Gospel-Age Levites' service as such was typed (2) by the various services of the Merarite Levites. Therefore they were as Gospel-Age Merarites to serve Jesus and the Church: as Mushites in publishing Bibles and other religious books and religious magazines and tracts, as well as pertinent secular publications, and as Mahlites in editing and correcting such literature. Thereby they served the Priesthood in two ways, putting at their convenient disposal pertinent literature, which was properly manufactured and edited. Thus their being set before Jesus and the Church put them into the Gospel-Age Merarite Levitical office, wherein they were made available to Jesus and the Church for these two services, wherein they stood ready to perform these two services and wherein they stood ready to respond to the calls of Jesus and the Church for these two services. The Gospel-Age Levites' service as such was typed (3) by the various services of the Kohathite Levites. Therefore they were as Gospel-Age Kohathites to serve Jesus and the Church with linguistical, exegetical, historical and systematic helps. They served, the Priesthood in four ways: by preparing for it learned lectures and works of the four kinds just mentioned. Thus their being set before Jesus and the Church put them into the Gospel-Age Kohathite Levitical service, wherein they were

made available to Jesus and the Church for these four services, wherein they stood ready to perform these four services and wherein they stood ready to respond to the calls of Jesus and the Church for these four services. Hence, setting the Levites before Aaron and his sons types the installation of the Gospel-Age Levites into their office before the Christ.

(65) The acts whereby this was done were various. In the case of ministers, evangelists and missionaries, as Gospel-Age Gershonites, it usually took the form of their being graduated from their theological studies, their election and call to a pastorate, to an evangelical service or to a mission field, their being ordained (in some denominations) or appointed (in others) and their being settled in their charges. All these acts set them before our Lord and the Church as Gospel-Age Libnite and Shimite Gershonites, the latter undergoing, additionally, special calls and appointments to service in leading people to consecrate. Less formal was the installation of Sunday-school superintendents and teachers, lay preachers and evangelists and catechists: their recognition as having the proper training for their work by the pertinent bodies, their nomination and election to their respective offices and their being put into the positions to function in them. Almost no formality occurred in inducting into humanly usually unnoticed position zealous laymen, who on their own zealous initiative have done Gospel-Age Libnite or Shimite work. Nor was there much form used in inducting Gospel-Age Merarites into their office as such. But they nevertheless were recognized as being qualified (the equivalent of graduation) for their pertinent positions, were chosen (the equivalent to the election and call) for their positions, and were instated in them, as can be seen from the experiences of pertinent publishers and their assistants and the literary editors and their assistants in religious publishing concerns. Usually with Gospel-Age Kohathites

the equivalents of graduation, election, call and appointment were made by Jesus alone, without co-operating human agencies, since theirs was an individual, as distinct from an organizational work (the Kohathites bore the furniture and vessels of the tabernacle on their shoulders, not in wagons).

(66) Moses' waving the Levites as a wave-offering unto or before the Lord is the final act of the Levites' consecration. This act gave them to God for continued service, in which they were to elevate and keep elevated their best powers and qualities for the service of God. This types how our Lord has given the Gospel-Age Levites to God as His own Levites, to serve Him continually as the last clause of v. 14 shows: "So shall the Levites be[come] Mine." Accordingly, the Gospel-Age Levites have been consecrated to God, not indeed to sacrifice, as were the Priests, but to serve God by serving the true Priests and the nominal people of God. This act of our Lord was invisible to us and was performed on the Levites by our Lord to God directly. We have learned of its having been done, not by the sight of it, but by our learning to understand the Word thereon and by beholding the subsequent works of the Levites implying such a consecration. The typical wave-offering further implies that the Gospel-Age Levites, as long as they remained such, were in their highest and best powers and qualities to be used for the Lord's service. This means that they were to serve in this way unto death, either as persons, or as Levites, *i.e.*, when they were, by consecration to sacrifice, graduated into the Priesthood, which occurred with all Levites who proved thoroughly faithful, and which made them cease to be Levites, and thus made them die as Levites. This waving of them implies that they were not to backslide; nor were they consecrated for a little while, after which they would be justified in giving up their service. It was, therefore, intended to last until their death as persons, or as Levites by becoming

Priests. Any Gospel-Age Levite who would go back to the camp by casting aside repentance and faith would be grossly violating his Levitical consecration. V. 14 simply gives us a summary of vs. 5 to 13: "Thus shalt thou separate the Levites from among the children of Israel; thus shall the Levites become Mine." Therefore, as sufficiently explained, it will call for no further comment.

(67) So far in this chapter we have studied vs. 5-14 of Num. 8. It will be noticed that these verses were commands directing what should be done in the cleansing and consecration of the Levites. The rest of the chapter, except v. 15, consists mainly of explanations and narrations on the cleansing, consecration and service of the Levites. The antitypes of these narrations have almost entirely been given above while commenting on the charges whose execution the narrations give. Accordingly, our study of the second part of this chapter will not be so long-drawn-out as was that of the first. Nevertheless, there are not a few things antitypical of the explanations found in vs. 16-26 that call for comment; and these we will now study.

(68) Several interesting items are found in v. 15. Its opening sentence shows that the typical Levites were not to serve in the tabernacle until the completion of their consecration. This, too, has been true of the antitype. The faith-justified had to await their being set before the Priesthood and waved unto the Lord by Jesus before they could begin their work of leading people to justification and consecration and of acting as publishers and editors and as authors of linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic helps for the Priesthood and nominal people of God in the Gospel-Age. This is indicated in the first clause of v. 15: "And after that [their consecration] shall the Levites go in to the service of the tabernacle of the congregation." At first sight the second and third clauses of this verse may be thought to be repeating the summary of

vs. 5-14 given in v. 14. But this would scarcely be necessary so soon after the same summary, differently worded, given in v. 14. Nor would it well fit in after the charge of the first clause of v. 15. And when we consider the antitypes that set in along with the antitype of that first clause, we are the more led to the thought that the cleansing and waving typed in v. 15 are such as set in after the Gospel-Age Levitical service has been entered into by the pertinent Levites. In other words, we understand the cleansing and waving of v. 15 to type such cleansing and waving as follow the consecration of the Gospel-Age Levites and as accompany their subsequent service until that service ends. Let us notice this more particularly.

(69) We are not to understand the cleansing of the Gospel-Age Levites that preceded their consecration to have been a completed cleansing in the sense of making them actually perfect and flawless. If this is not true of the cleansing of the Gospel-Age Priests (1 John 1: 8), it certainly could not be true of the Gospel-Age Levites. So far as this cleansing concerned their justification it was a reckoned perfection; and so far as it concerned their actual condition it delivered them from the dominion of sin, which henceforth they could conquer, but not without more or less wounds incidental to the warfare against it. In other words, they were still more or less actually contaminated by sin, even if it was no more their lord. This made them frequently guilty of sins of weakness and ignorance, and sometimes of mixed sins—sins that had a measure of willfulness along with ignorance and weakness. Thus like, and, generally speaking, more than the Gospel-Age Priesthood, they have had filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit (2 Cor. 7: 1), from which it was necessary to cleanse themselves; and in this cleansing work our Lord assisted them daily as their need was; and in so doing He fulfilled throughout their justification standing the charge of v. 15 to cleanse them.

This we have doubtless observed in others and experienced ourselves. As we look back at our justification experiences we can doubtless recall many a fight that we had with sin and our Lord's faithful help of us by the Word and providence. In executing this part of His charge as given in the second clause of v. 15 our dear Lord showed us much kindness, mercy, longsuffering, forbearance, patience and love, as He helped us from victory to victory, and as he lifted us up from defeat after defeat, ever encouraging, supporting, comforting, warning, correcting, uplifting us as our varied cases required. Had it not been for this gracious ministry of His, we would have fallen by the wayside and never have attained to consecration; but by His pertinent activities He brought us on to consecration. Thanks be to God, who so graciously arranged for such a ministry, and to Christ, who so faithfully exercised it to our profit.

(70) The charge to wave the Levites as a wave-offering (v. 15), given for execution after their consecration, implied that Moses was to continue furnishing opportunities of service to the Levites, encouraging and influencing them faithfully to use them; otherwise they doubtless would have failed to serve as such many a time. In the antitype this would mean that after faith-justified ones had become serving Gershonites, the Lord Jesus was charged to furnish them opportunities of bringing people to justification and consecration, which He did as abundantly as their loyalty and the need warranted. So, too, after faith-justified ones had become serving Merarites, our Lord Jesus was charged to furnish them opportunities to engage in the work of publishing and editing Bibles and other religious books and religious magazines and tracts and pertinent secular books, which He did as much as their faithfulness and the conditions required. It also means that after faith-justified ones had become serving Kohathites, our Lord Jesus was charged to furnish

them with opportunities of writing linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic books, magazines and tracts, which He did as largely as their zeal and the pertinent calls for them occasioned. Not only so, but He encouraged them to go on in their work amid the obstacles that confronted them therein. He saw to it that all needful helps for their service were placed at their disposal. Nor did He do this for a little while and then, wearying, give it up. He persevered in it unto a completion, as is implied in the word *waved.* Not only so, but He assisted them to keep their highest powers elevated to God in their service, which also is implied in the waving. We have observed this as His dealings with the Gospel-Age Levites; and when we were such ourselves we experienced it ourselves in the Levite group to which we belonged. Thus Jesus not only received the charge to wave the Gospel-Age Levites unto the Lord after their consecration; but also faithfully fulfilled the charge.

(71) The following is Rotherham's rendering of v. 16, based on a better reading of the Hebrew text than the one used as the basis for the translation of the Authorized Version: "For given, given they are unto me out of the midst of the sons of Israel instead of every firstborn that a mother beareth; from among the sons of Israel have I taken them unto me." In the type the firstborn were one set of persons, and the tribe of Levi, except the firstborn among them, were another set of persons. But in the antitype the firstborn and antitypical Levi (including both Priests and "Levites") are the same persons. The two sets of persons in the type were used to represent, not two sets of persons, but one set of persons having two relations. As firstborns their higher position than that of the afterborns is brought to our attention; and as antitypical Levi their religious office (Priests and Levites) is emphasized. Other offices of the Gospel-Age new creatures are brought out by other names, like: chosen generation,

holy nation, peculiar people, etc. From the standpoint of their relation to the finished picture the Gospel-Age firstborn may be classified into two kinds: (1) tentative and (2) final. All the justified and all the new creatures, the latter until their calling and election is made sure, *i.e.*, until the death of the Faithful, are the tentative firstborn. By this is meant that they are conditionally of the firstborn; for, so far as the finished picture is concerned, those of the faith-justified who fail to consecrate cease to be Levites in the finished picture; and those of the new creatures who fail to win out cease to be Priests in the finished picture. From the new creatures in the finished picture in the end of the Age emerge the actual firstborn: those crown-losers who, cleansed, remain loyal as antitypical Levites and those crown-retainers who remain faithful as antitypical Priests. The Youthful Worthies, accordingly, are of the tentative firstborn now, as they and the Ancient Worthies will also be such during the next Age. But in its finished picture both of these classes as final overcomers will be of the final Levites and firstborn. The above distinctions should be kept in mind in order to be able to see how the Gospel-Age Levites—the faith-justified—could have been of the firstborn. They are of the tentative, not the final firstborn.

(72) The expression, "given, given," is a Hebraism, like, "holy of holies." It is used to indicate the superlative degree in which the giving was done. The A. V. by the expression, "wholly given," renders the sense properly, for it means given in the highest, fullest sense of the word. The Levites' being chosen in the place of the firstborn is described in Num. 3: 40-51, which we expounded while treating of that section in Chap. II. It will be noted that Rotherham's rendering of parts of this verse is quite different from that of the A.V. Rotherham follows a better reading of the original than did the A.V. Dr. Ginsburg, who has given us the

best edition of the Hebrew Old Testament, offers the reading followed by Rotherham as the correct one, while that followed by the A. V. is scarcely intelligible in the Hebrew. The literal rendering of the correct reading as Rotherham gives it in his notes is: "Every firstborn bursting open a matrix." His text rendering given above is more euphemistic, giving the sense aright.

(73) The character of Levites, as being devoted to God exclusively, is taught with emphasis in this verse. Not only is this emphasis indicated by the expression, "given, given," but also by the twofold mention of their being taken out from among the rest of Israel and the twofold statement that they were God's. Emphasis on this thought is further implied by the fact that as such Divine possession they were taken instead of the firstborn. This emphasis stresses the importance of the antitypical tribe of Levi, the Gospel-Age Priests and Levites. These are God's in a peculiar sense, the Gospel-Age Priests as sacrificers who work at-one-ment between God and men, and the Gospel-Age Levites as servants who render needed assistance to the people as their religious teachers and to the Priests as leaders of people to justification and consecration, as lecturers and as writers of learned linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic works and as the editors and publishers of these, as well as of Bibles. This emphasis, doubtless, is intended to be a very solemn lesson and exhortation to the Gospel-Age Priests and Levites to remember the purpose of their calling to their respective offices and to fulfill these carefully and faithfully as persons who do not own themselves, but who are owned by God (1 Cor. 6: 20; 7: 23). Accordingly, unfaithfulness therein would be unfaithfulness to God, who would require a full accounting for it; and faithfulness therein would be faithfulness to God, who would give a full reward for it. Therefore, faithfulness on the part of the Gospel-Age Levites

therein led to promotion to the Priesthood; and, when this was no longer possible, to Youthful-Worthiship, while unfaithfulness therein would result in their being remanded to the Camp. And faithfulness on the part of the Priests would lead to promotion to the Kingdom, while measurable unfaithfulness therein would result in their forfeiting their crowns, and full unfaithfulness would result in their loss of life altogether.

(74) V. 17 explains how the firstborn became the Lord's. It was in connection with the Passover in Egypt (Ex. 12: 3-13, 21-23, 29, 30). Wherever the lamb's blood was sprinkled on the lintels and door posts the firstborn of man and beast remained alive. Wherever no lamb's blood was sprinkled on the lintels and door posts the firstborn of man and beast died. By having their lintels and door posts sprinkled the Israelites were passed over by the destruction; hence their firstborn of man and beast were spared from death. But the Egyptians having no lamb's blood sprinkled on their lintels and door posts, their firstborn of man and beast were destroyed in death. Each Israelite's house represented God's household in its tentative and vitalized aspect. The door represented Christ, the door posts represented Divine Justice and the lintels the ones to whom the merit is tentatively and vitalizedly imputed. The lamb represented our Lord's humanity (John 1: 29; 1 Cor. 5: 7, 8); its blood, His right to life and His life-rights. The sprinkling of the blood represented: (1) Christ's imputing to justice His right to life and life-rights *for* believers and (2) God's imputing these *to* believers. As the Israelites who remained in their houses, and thus under the blood's protection, were passed over; so those who remain in God's household during the Gospel-Age, and thus under the protection of Christ's blood, escape the second death. This picture is tentative for the tentative firstborn of the justified class, of course. Those

who will become of the final firstborn, of course, have the real danger and the real deliverance, while the tentative firstborn of the justified, losing their tentative standing, drop back among the afterborn. The firstborn of man represented the New Creatures in the finished picture, and the firstborn of beast represented their humanity. Israel's firstborn of man represented in the finished picture, therefore, the New Creatures of the final Little Flock and Great Company, while Israel's firstborn of beast represented in the finished picture their humanity. Egypt's firstborn of man represented in the finished picture the New Creatures of the second death class, while Egypt's firstborn of beast represented their humanity. It will be noted that it was by the blood that the firstborn were spared. The blood as typical of the ransom-price typically purchased them for God, and by their abiding in God's household He retained them. Thus God became their owner, and that on the day of God's smiting the firstborn of Egypt, when He separated Israel's firstborn to Himself. This is the thought stated in v. 17. The firstborn being owned by God, and He exchanging them for the tribe of Levi, of course that tribe became His, even as vs. 16-18 teach it to be the case.

(75) Leaving vs. 16-18 as sufficiently discussed by the above, we now take up the discussion of v. 19. In this verse are a number of matters that call for explanation, both in type and antitype. Literally translated, as the margin shows, the first clause reads: "And I have given the Levites, *given* to Aaron and his sons." The italicized word *given* serves to emphasize the gift as fully made. In the type the Levites were fully given to Aaron and his sons to take down, put up and carry the tabernacle and its appurtenances, also to teach the people their duties and privileges as to the tabernacle and its services. In the antitype, not only have the Gospel-Age Levites had the service of helping the people in their relations toward Christ and the

Church and their services, but especially did they have the work of serving Jesus and the Church as leaders of people to justification and consecration by speech and writings, as writers of learned linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic works and as editors and publishers of the same writings. This was more especially their work than the work that they did in teaching the people, though both were their service. This twofold service is called in the literal translation of the Hebrew a laborious service, and it doubtless was laborious. The Levites in this verse are first of all spoken of as having been given, given to Aaron and then to his sons. This implies that they were primarily Aaron's as the high priest and secondarily his sons' as under-priests, for their help. In the antitype, accordingly, the faith-justified as Levites are primarily given wholly to our Lord Jesus as High Priest and are secondarily given wholly to His Under-priests. Accordingly, they help our Lord to execute His office as High Priest. We can readily see how they have done this; for the Gershonites have certainly furthered His work by serving Him in bringing people through repentance and faith to justification and consecration; for by so doing they have assisted Him in winning new Gospel-Age Levites and Priests. The Kohathites have certainly helped Him by their writings to give the antitypical Camp needed information to keep them from error and to make them, generally speaking, more believing in Christianity's general Truth. And they have certainly helped Him by giving the Under-priesthood scholarly writings that furnished them help, making them more available to our Lord for His service in various ways. So, too, the Merarites, by acting as publishers and editors of Bibles and of Gershonite writings helpful to justification and consecration and of Kohathite writings helpful on linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic subjects, assisted our Lord to help both the people and the Under-priesthood. In all these things

these Gospel-Age Levites assisted our Lord to carry out the above features of His work as High Priest toward the Under-priests and the people.

(76) We will now study how they have assisted the Under-priests as wholly given to them. In several ways the Gershonites helped the Under-priests. It will be recalled that to the Church was given the commission to preach throughout the Gospel-Age repentance and remission of sins (Mark 16: 15, 16; Luke 24: 47; John 16: 8-11; 20: 22-23; Acts 13: 38; Is. 61: 1, 2). And this was a part of her special mission up to the Harvest, when her attention was given to the reaping as her special work. Accordingly, beginning with Pentecost, throughout the Age the Elijah class has sought to turn sinners to God (Mal. 4: 6). This being the case, we are prepared to see how the antitypical Libnite Gershonites, whose work was to bring people through repentance and faith to justification, assisted the Church in winning such as might become candidates for consecration. For thus they helped the faithful Church in the first part of the work of taking out of the nations a people for His name (Acts 15: 14). The first part of that work, of course, was to bring people to justification. The second part of that work was to bring people to consecration. In this second part of the work the faithful Church also had to engage, as we can see from St. Paul's exhortation in Rom. 12: 1. And naturally as the antitypical Shimite Gershonites influenced people to consecrate, they assisted the Church in winning certain ones for the high calling. Therefore in doing their respective works these Libnites and Shimites served the Under-priests.

(77) But the Gospel-Age Kohathites helped the Church more than did the Gershonites and Merarites. This is indicated both by the typical Kohathites' nearer blood relationship to the typical under-priesthood and by their work of bearing the tabernacle's furniture and vessels, the most sacred things of the tabernacle. And

in the antitypical Kohathites' service they have helped the whole Under-priesthood, but more especially such of these as have been the Lord's special mouthpieces. All of us can readily recall how many helps we have got, especially from the antitypical Amramite Kohathites, whose work has been to render the Priests helps on linguistic matters. By bringing various readings, interpolations, etc., to our attention in their recensions of critical texts of the Greek and Hebrew—as antitypical Gershonite Amramites—they have helped us out of many a difficulty as to what is the proper reading of the original, *e.g.*, how many of us have been helped to recognize as fallacious the proof that the orthodox offer for the creedal trinity, based on 1 John 5: 7, in which, by the investigations of antitypical Gershonite Amramites, like Drs. Tischendorf, Westcott, Hort, Weiss, etc., we have learned that the pertinent words are interpolations. Time and again these in the New Testament, and Dr. Ginsburg in the Old Testament, have offered us better readings of the original that enabled us to see clearly the Scripturalness of certain phases of Truth obscured by false readings on which some of our translations are based.

(78) The antitypical Eliezerite Amramites have also greatly assisted us by their word studies and helps. Many are the helps that we have thus gotten from various translations, some helping us along lines from which we could get no help from others, the latter in turn giving us shades of thought required by the Truth, that we could not get from the former. The makers of concordances have helped us to gain a better Scriptural insight into the meanings of Bible words. How many of the Priests have, therefore, been helped by Dr. Cruden's Concordance! Still more help, especially on the various shades of meanings in the original words, have we gotten from Dr. Young's Analytical Concordance. And Dr. Strong's Exhaustive Concordance has given us. even more help than the

others, since by its Greek and Hebrew Dictionaries it combines all the excellencies of Dr. Young's Concordance, plus others that the latter does not have, and minus several deficiencies that the latter does have. For general use as a passage finder, Dr. Walker's Comprehensive Concordance, which does not refer to the Greek and Hebrew, but which contains about 250,000 references, about 60,000 less than Dr. Young and 50,000 more than Dr. Cruden, is very convenient. For convenience and time saving it is preferable to the last two mentioned. If one can have only one concordance, Dr. Strong is much to be preferred. Not only as helps on the meaning of Bible words, but as passage finders and helps for general Bible study and for preparation of elders' and pilgrims' discourses and other lessons, these concordance-makers have been very helpful to the general Priesthood. So, too, have Greek and Hebrew concordances helped the Priesthood on the meanings and uses of Greek and Hebrew words in the Bible. Our Pastor often expressed his appreciation of the great help that he derived from the Englishmen's Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek Concordances of the Bible. Many another Priest who did not understand these languages got splendid help from them, because they cite in English under the pertinent original words all of the verses in which they occur. Thence the name *Englishmen's* Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek Concordances. Then, there are concordances, like Bruder's and Moulton's and Giden's, that cite under every New Testament Greek word all of the verses in which it occurs in Greek. Davidson's and Mandelkern's Concordances do the same for the Old Testament in Hebrew. Greek and Hebrew dictionaries and grammars likewise have given their need of help to various of the Priests in the various meanings and forms of Greek and Hebrew words and the various uses of the forms and constructions of Greek and Hebrew.

(79) While the antitypical Amramites have given

the Under-priests more and better help than the other antitypical Kohathites, yet the other branches of the antitypical Kohathites have also rendered them welcome assistance. The introductionists, as antitypical Zichrite Izeharites, have rendered them good help in the way of proving what books belong, and what books do not belong, to the Bible, by giving an account of the development of the canon of the Bible, and in the way of giving histories, settings, descriptions and analyses of each of its separate books. The exegetes, as antitypical Nephegite Izeharites, have brought to the attention of the Priesthood many a fact, many a linguistic, historical, geographical and archeological hint, that helped to a better understanding of Bible verses. And, surely, the antitypical Korahite Izeharites, by their harmonies of the Gospels and parallel Old Testament histories, by their indices of Bible topics, by their collections of passages topically arranged and by their reference Bibles, have helped the Priesthood to compare Scripture with Scripture and to get quickly together goodly lists of passages under their pertinent topics. Especially helpful on lines of antitypical Korahite works to some of the Priests have been Robinson's Harmony of the Gospels, the American Tract Society's Bible Text Book, Nave's Topical Bible, and The Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge. The latter, in connection with the pertinent words or phrases of the Bible verses, which are given in the order of their Biblical occurrence, contains 500,000 Scriptural references to parallel passages, beside many notes, some of which are quite valuable. These have proven helpful to the Priests who use them, as the writer knows.

(80) So, too, have the writings of the antitypical Hebronite Kohathites ministered assistance to the Priests. In their Biblical histories and biographies many a fine archeological, chronological and geographical fact, many a contemporary heathen and Jewish event and many a rabbinical side light, have they

brought out, shedding light or corroboration on the Biblical account. On this phase the pertinent writings of Edersheim, Prideaux, the earlier Lightfoot and Ramsay have been very helpful. The writings of the Church historians and biographers are indispensable to the Priests for tracing the prophetic and typical fulfillments of Biblical prophecies and facts during the Gospel-Age. On these points the pertinent writings of John Foxe, Mosheim, Neander, Fisher and Kurtz have been and will yet be very useful, and, additionally, the pertinent writings of Giesseler, Schaff, Milman, Lea, etc., will yet doubtless prove very helpful. Books treating of the geography, archeology and sociology of the Bible lands, especially of Palestine, not only have lent clarification and corroboration to Biblical matters, but are especially helpful in construing such typology as is connected with the Biblical lands and their places. For this reason the pertinent writings of Robinson, Thompson, Ramsay, Palmer, Conder, Van-Lemmep, Trumbull, Sayce, etc., have proven very assistful. The same remark applies to the writings of some of the Biblical and secular chronologians; for these have helped the Priests in their study of the times and seasons of the Word, especially in construing chronological prophecy. Here men like Priestly, Hengstenberg, Tregelles, etc., have done good work

(81) From the systematic theologians the Priests have gotten the least help obtainable from the four groups of the antitypical Kohathites. Especially is this true of the dogmaticians, the antitypical Elzaphanite Uzzielites. Apart from when these explain, prove and defend from attacks the stewardship doctrines of their respective denominations, these have usually been in such darkness and error as to be hindrances, rather than helps to the Priests. But in their stewardship doctrines many a helpful hint will be found, *e.g.*, Dr. Hodges the famous Presbyterian divine, will be found to give splendid arguments in favor of the bread and

wine as representing the body and blood of Christ, against the doctrine of the real presence in its forms of transubstantiation (the Romish view) and instrumentalization (the Lutheran view); and Dr. Philippi, the famous Lutheran theologian, gives excellent points in explanation, proof and defense of justification by faith alone. And so we could go on referring to dogmaticians of all twelve of the denominational groups of Christendom. These have doubtless been helpful to the Priests in their respective denominations; and the aggregate of them on the twelve stewardship doctrines of Christendom's twelve denominational groups would give even present Priests some good helps on points involving these stewardship doctrines. About the same remarks, but more widely favorable, may be made on the ethicians, the antitypical Mishaelite Uzzielites, in so far as their corrections and instructions in righteousness as to their denominations' stewardship doctrines are concerned. These, *e.g.*, Martinsen, Harless and Weidener, give excellent points on correction of misconduct and on instruction in righteousness in the relations of these to justification by faith; so, also, Smyth in his book, Christian Ethics, will be found very serviceable in corrections and instructions in righteousness in respect to matters related to the Lord's Supper. But the ethicians are more reliable than the dogmaticians, because on most questions of ethics there is fair harmony among those of different denominations, while such is not the case with dogmaticians of the different denominations.

(82) The apologists, antitypical Zithrite Uzzielites, have been the most helpful to the Priests of all the antitypical Uzzielites. Indeed, there is much less of error in their writings than in those of the other two groups of systematic writers. This is due to the fact that their work is to prove the Bible to be God's revelation and to defend it from infidelistic attacks. Therefore, their writings give many arguments to prove the

Bible to be from God and worthy of acceptance. This makes them refute false ideas of God, such as Atheism, Materialism, Evolutionism, Agnosticism, Pantheism, Deism, Rationalism, Polytheism, etc. Next, it has been their work to prove the Bible to be credible from the standpoints of contemporary history, prophecy, miracles, contents (especially Christ, as its center) and its effects. Accordingly, they have defended it against all attacks from infidelism and higher criticism. The writings of Butler, Paley, Keith, Rawlinson, Bruce, Green, Orr, Urquhart, Zahn, Koenig, etc., have been very helpful to various Priests and are still so whenever used on the pertinent questions. These scholars, as well as a host of others, have well defended the outward works of the citadel of faith against myriads of so-called philosophical, higher-critical and scientific attacks, and have beaten these off, to the security of the citadel of Christianity itself. These attacks have not only been numerous, but as varied and learned in character and tactics as the ingenuity of devils and men could make them; and for Christian scholars to have driven them back is one of the proofs of the Divine source of the Bible, which under assault has been an impregnable fortress.

(83) It has been the work of representatives of all four groups of antitypical Kohathites, the antitypical Amramites, Izeharites, Hebronites and Uzzielites, to produce the numerous Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias, as well as ecclesiastical and theological and pertinent secular encyclopedias, in which for ready reference the main features of antitypical Kohathite helps are to be found. Of course these do not give the many details that can be found in other forms of antitypical Kohathite works; nevertheless for purposes of reference they give their information in convenient form. The chiefly helpful works of this kind in English among Bible dictionaries are Smith's Bible Dictionary, which has appeared in many editions of

varying sizes, dependent on the amount of their abridgement, Hasting's Dictionaries of the whole Bible (which in the Old Testament is much tinctured with higher criticism) and of the Gospels and of the Apostolic Church. Chiefly helpful among Bible encyclopedias are the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia and the pertinent part of McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia. Chiefly helpful among theological encyclopedias are the last mentioned work, Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Smith's Dictionaries of Christian Biography and Antiquities and Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. The above are Protestant works. To these may be added the Catholic and Jewish encyclopedias as more or less helpful. Among English secular encyclopedias that have proven most helpful to the Priests may be mentioned Chambers', the Britannica and the Americana. Of course, in other languages, there have been works similar to the above-mentioned. Since such works have been compendious depositories of antitypical Kohathite learning for quick help for Priests, they have been very advantageous. But one must not look to these for great details on antitypical Kohathite subjects; these must be sought in antitypical Kohathite works especially devoted to the pertinent subjects. Our readers have in many cases the large abridged Smith's Bible Dictionary and from experience with it know the above remarks to be true.

(84) While various antitypical Kohathite works have been helpful to all the Priests, they have been especially helpful to the mouthpiece Priests all during the Age after the Ephesian period, especially since the Thyatira period. We will instance several recent illustrations of these. Our Pastor is a case to the point, as he frequently witnessed to this fact. As is well known; he was not a Greek or Hebrew scholar, a fact of which nominal-church mouthpieces frequently sought to make capital, to his disparagement. But this fact,

coupled with the further fact that he understood the Bible, which his detractors who knew Greek and Hebrew greatly misunderstood, puts them to shame, for it shows that God has hidden the Truth from the wise and prudent of this world and has revealed it to babes—the humble and meek. How did our Pastor make up for his deficiencies in Greek and Hebrew? By using antitypical Amramite writings on these subjects. In hundreds of cases nominal-church errors were entrenched in mistranslations and inapplicable correct translations, while the Truth lay in the correct and applicable translations. How was it possible that our Pastor, not knowing the Greek and Hebrew, grounded the Truth on the corrected translations? First, the Lord, working on his mind, suggested the correct thought to him. Then, going to his Greek and Hebrew dictionaries he found that, among the various meanings that the pertinent words had, such as gave the right thought occurred. Then, going to his Greek and Hebrew concordances and various translations, *e.g.*, the Diaglott, he searched out the passages in which that particular meaning occurred and thus he saw in the pertinent Hebrew and Greek words the thoughts that the Truth required to be in those words. We might instance the Hebrew words *Jehovah* and *Adon*, *ruach* and *nephesh*, *sheol* and *qeber* and the Greek words *krino*, *krisis* and *krima*, *egersis* and *anastasis*, *hades*, *mneion* and *gehenna*. When we first studied through the six volumes we counted several hundred instances in which the Truth lay in the correct and appropriate translations, as our Pastor gave them, while in those cases the errors rested on mistranslations or inapplicable meanings. This fact was very reassuring to us, who at that time knew that our Pastor was not a Greek or Hebrew scholar; and it helped us to recognize that the Lord was using him as that Servant. In a similar way he got helps from the antitypical Gershonite Amramites on interpolations and variant readings,

e.g., Tischendorf's renderings of the Sinaitic, Vatican and Alexandrian MSS, wherever they varied from the A. V., as these were given at the bottom of the pages of Tauchnitz's edition of the New Testament.

(85) Other antitypical Kohathites gave him pertinent help. Some of the exegetical notes quoted in the Diaglott from various commentators assisted him. How could he have written the chronological parts of Vols. 2 and 3 without assistance from the chronologians? How could he have written the anti-Christ chapter of Vol. 2 and the first parts of Vol. 3 without the help of Church historians, *e.g.*, that long quotation that he makes in that chapter, wherein the pope boasts of his title, prerogatives, riches, servants and territories, he quoted and abridged from Foxe's Acts and Monuments of the Martyrs? The chapter gives direct evidence that in its preparation he consulted Mosheim, Lord, White and other writers on Church history. How could he have written the Pyramid chapter of Vol. 3 without assistance from antitypical Hebronites in the field of archeology? Vol. 4 contains multitudes of quotations from antitypical Hebronite Kohathites. Vol. 5 contains much lexical and grammatical information that he got from antitypical Eliezerite Amramites. So, too, very often in the Tower does our Pastor quote or use matter from antitypical Kohathites of all four of their groups. Thus we see the special help that he as a special mouthpiece Priest received from the antitypical Kohathites; and he also, on suitable occasions, acknowledged his indebtedness to these for such help.

(86) The Epiphany messenger likewise acknowledges his indebtedness for help derived from Gospel-Age Levites. We will instance this in several cases. Without the facts that he gathered from Church historians and biographers he would have been unable to write articles like: Elijah—Type and Antitype, Ahab and Ben-Hadad—Type and Antitype, Ahaziah—Type and Antitype, Jehoram of Judah—Type and Antitype,

the Gospel-Age Israelites, the Gospel-Age Levites, the Gospel-Age Sinners, the Gospel-Age Nazarites, the Offerings of the Gospel-Age Princes, etc., etc. In preparing the parallel passages in our Helps For Devotional Service, he saved much time by the assistance of the antitypical Korahite Izeharites, as these have also saved him much time in other articles by furnishing him collections of passages topically arranged. In the Robisono-Universalism series he quoted from the best grammars of the Greek New Testament, thus using helps from one of the branches of the antitypical Eliezerite Amramites. In discussing separate words like *parousia*, *epiphaneia, apokalypsis*, *aion*, *aionios*, *nephesh*, *ruach*, *psyche*, *pneuma*, etc., etc., he made as time savers much use of Bruder's Concordance to the Greek New Testament and Davidson's Concordance to the Hebrew Old Testament, as well as the Englishmen's Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek Concordances. Dr. Strong's and Dr. Young's concordances were also laid under contribution. Various translations and Greek and Hebrew dictionaries were used on pertinent questions. In his work he very frequently has occasion to refer to the writings of Gospel-Age Kohathites. For this reason his library consists largely of the best works that the Gospel-Age Kohathites have produced; and it has been built up largely from the standpoint of the Gospel-Age Priestly and Levitical picture. We are not from the above acknowledgment of the indebtedness of the mouthpiece Priests to the Gospel-Age Levites to understand that they get their teachings (the antitypical vessels) from such Levites; for these carry the antitypical vessels covered, ununderstood; but we are rather to understand from the above that such Priests get from such Levites helps that greatly save their time and furnish them with facts and items that clarify or prove various features of the teachings, *e.g.*, what great time savers to a mouthpiece Priest is a Greek or Hebrew concordance that gives every word

everywhere it occurs. A Priest who knows Greek and Hebrew could get all of the occurrences of various Greek and Hebrew words by reading the Hebrew and Greek Testaments through in a search for them; but he has no time for that. Instead he takes Bruder's, etc., or Davidson's, etc., Concordances, and thus quickly he can study each passage in which the pertinent Greek or Hebrew word occurs, as we did in the case of the Greek and Hebrew words mentioned in this paragraph, and as our Pastor did with the words mentioned in paragraph 84. How much light, *e.g.*, is thrown on the story of Jacob and Esau and the birthright by the knowledge that archeologists have given us on the duty of a firstborn to fast and the afterborn to feast on the birthday of a notable ancestor, according to which Esau asked Jacob on Abraham's birthday to fast in his place, while Esau feasted in Jacob's place, thus forfeiting the birthright! It is to minister such services as these that God has given the Gospel-Age Levites to the Priests, but not to give them the Priestly teachings themselves.

(87) So, too, were the Gospel-Age Merarites given to the Under-priests for their help, but, of course, in different ways from the Gospel-Age Gershonites and Kohathites. The Gospel-Age Merarites stand as a connecting link between the other two sets of Levites, especially of the Kohathites, and the Priests. They do not stand free from them in their service of the Priests. In their publishing and editing vernacular Bibles they do a work for the Priests, but as intermediaries of those Gospel-Age Eliezerite Amramites, who acted as translators of the pertinent versions; and in their editing and publishing Greek or Hebrew Bibles, they do a work for the Priests as intermediaries of the Gospel-Age Gershonite Amramites, who acted as the Greek or Hebrew text recensionists. Again, as editors and publishers of dictionaries, grammars and concordances of the Greek and Hebrew or of the vernaculars, they do a

service for the Priests, but as intermediaries of the antitypical Eliezerite Amramites who wrote those books. These same remarks apply to the publishing and editing of the various Gospel-Age Izeharite, Hebronite and Uzzielite works. In other words, how could the Priests avail themselves of the writings of the Gospel-Age Kohathites, unless they were edited, printed and published, which is the work of the Gospel-Age Merarites? If this were not done to them they would be written in vain. Accordingly, the Gospel-Age Merarites are the connecting link between the Gospel-Age Kohathites and the Priests to make available to the latter's use the literary works of the former. The Gospel-Age Gershonites have also produced some writings, such as lead people through repentance and faith to justification and from justification onward to consecration. These works the Gospel-Age Merarites edit and publish and thereby co-operate with the Gospel-Age Gershonites in serving the antitypical Camp, Levites and Priests, and the Camp by such cooperation with the Gershonites in helping them as to their Camp relations to God, the Levites by such co-operation with the Gershonites in bringing them to justification and in helping some of them onward to consecration, and the Priests by such cooperation with the Gershonites in furnishing them with antitypical Levites and Priests. Accordingly, we see, from the part of v. 19 that we have studied, that all of the Gospel-Age Levites have assisted the Priests, and for this reason have been given wholly to them.

(88) We will now consider the second half of v. 19, the part treating of the Levites' making an atonement for the Israelites and thus preventing plagues coming upon Israel in their approach to the tabernacle. At first thought we might be surprised at the expression that the Levites were to make an atonement for the people; but if so, this surprise vanishes when we remember that the atonement comprises two

features: (1) making God pleased with the people; and (2) making the people pleased with God. The Levites had nothing to do with making atonement for the people in the first sense of the word; for that was done by the priests, represented in Aaron, by the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement. Nor did the Levites effect the more important part of the second feature of the atonement; for this, too, was effected by the priests; but they did perform a subordinate part in the second feature of the atonement work; for by their teachings and example they encouraged the Israelites to become pleased with Jehovah in His Word and Ways; for they taught the people the various privileges, beliefs, heart qualities and works connected with their relation to the Lord and His service, as these centered in the tabernacle, and thereby encouraged them to live and act in harmony therewith. Their appreciating and obeying these arrangements, etc., likewise encouraged the people to do the same; and by these various things the Israelites were helped more and more to become pleased with the Lord. Thus in this sense the Levites made an atonement for the people of the Lord.

(89) Looking at the antitype it is easy to recognize how the antitypical Levites made atonement for the antitypical Camp, the unjustified nominal people of God. Certainly, it was not in the sense of sharing in the sin-offerings, and thus effecting the first part of the atonement; for this work is that of the Christ, Head and Body, alone (Heb. 7: 26, 27; 10: 1-10; Heb. 13: 10-13). Nor has it been as the chief workers of the second feature of the atonement work; for this, too, was the exclusive work of the Priesthood, the crown-retainers and crown-losers of the Gospel-Age, since it was the special work of these as possessors of the Spirit to reprove the world—the antitypical Camp—for sin, righteousness and judgment to come (John 16: 8-11). But the faith-justified in their three groups

were privileged to be the assistants of the new creatures in this work, and they succeeded in working in the people a measure of pleasement with God, that much as they would allow compatibly with their being parts of the antitypical Camp; for those in the antitypical Camp were not in quantity or quality so much pleased with God as the Levites were and certainly much less so than the Priests were. Nor did God expect that degree of pleasement with Him from the unjustified antitypical Camp as He did from the Levites or the Priests. Any degree of being pleased with God and His ways short of real repentance and faith was sufficient to keep one in "good standing" in the antitypical Camp. This would include their having a measure of knowledge of God, of Christ and of His death for sin, of the Bible, of sin, of righteousness and of their having some of God's favor and a measure of love for God, Christ and the Bible and of a desire to live at least with a degree of harmony with these things as God's professed people. But their development in these respects would stop short of repentance and faith, which are the transitional steps out of the antitypical Camp into the antitypical Court. And these things were in part ministered to them by the Gospel-Age Levites, who thereby effected in them the above-described measure of the second feature of the atonement work, which measure was necessary for them in order to have such a degree of pleasement with God as was indispensable to their being of the antitypical Camp.

(90) Nor is it hard to see how the various groups and sub-groups of the Gospel-Age Levites effected such an atonement. Of course, the Libnite Gershonites, in preaching, writing on, etc., the general features of the Law and the Gospel, gave them some of the knowledge above described, as well as stirred up in them the desire to have some of God's favor, to reverence the Bible and to live measurably against sin and

for righteousness. Such knowledge, love and desire increased in them by their attendance on the preached and written ministries of the Shimite Gershonites on right living and consecration. Some little help would they get from the recensional work of the Gershonite Amramite Kohathites, especially as this would be reflected in translations, though a few learned Camp members have gotten some larger help from the Greek, Hebrew and ancient translation recensions of such Kohathites. Such help would be promotive of the knowledge and heart's attitude above described for members of the antitypical Camp. The Gospel-Age Eliezerite Amramites have been more assistful to the Camp in gaining the above things, especially by their translations and concordances, while the more learned in the antitypical Camp have gotten some helps to that pertinent knowledge and heart's attitude from these and also from Grammars and Dictionaries of the Biblical Hebrew and Greek. The Zichrite Izeharites, by introductory thoughts on the Bible have helped the Camp better to corresponding knowledge and to cherish a measure of reverence for the Bible. The Nephegite Izeharites, as exegetes, have helped the antitypical Camp to understand some Bible verses or parts of them; and the Korahite Izeharites have, by their digests, harmonies, references and indices to the Bible, given them a better idea of some Bible subjects, with a corresponding better heart's attitude. The Hebronites, especially by their Bible Histories, Biographies, Geographies and Antiquities, have helped them to the pertinent knowledge and heart's attitude. The Elzaphanite Uzzielites by their doctrinal teachings, and the Mishaelite Uzzielites by their ethical teachings, have contributed a great deal to these ends. Especially helpful against various forms of unbelief and in favor of believing the Bible from "kiver to kiver," as some from the Camp have expressed it, have the Zithrite Uzzielites been, through their attacks on unbelieving theories,

through their proofs of the Bible's veracity and through their defenses of it against infidelistic attacks. Of course, the antitypical Mahlite Merarites, by their editorial work, and the antitypical Mushite Merarites, by their publishing work, with reference to the books on the above-indicated lines of antitypical Gershonite and Kohathite service, also assisted in this phase of the atonement work for the Gospel-Age Camp.

(91) The purpose of making such an atonement is stated in v. 19, as follows: "that there be no plague among the children of Israel, when the children of Israel come nigh unto the sanctuary." In the type a literal plague or calamity is referred to and this statement was in harmony with the Lord's covenant arrangements with Israel: to give them physical blessings and to shield them from physical evils, if they were obedient to their covenant obligations, but to bring upon, and not shield them from physical ills, if they were disobedient thereto. The Levites faithfully performing their part in the pertinent atonement work toward Israel were instrumental in keeping them in a condition in which plagues did not afflict them, while their unfaithfulness in performing their part in such atonement work resulted in Israel's violating their covenant obligations, becoming more or less displeased with God and His ways, which was followed by literal plagues of various kinds coming upon them. Thus the times of Israel's prosperity were marked by faithfulness in the Levites to their work, as can be seen in a general way in the reigns of David, Solomon, Hezekiah and Jehoshaphat, while their unfaithfulness therein can be well seen, among other ways, in the great plague that came upon Israel in connection with the rebellion of Korah and his company of 250 Levite leaders, who were doubtless aided and abetted by less influential Levites in the rank and file.

(92) Turning to the antitype, we can see that when the Gospel-Age Libnite and Shimite Gershonites faith

fully preached and wrote on repentance, faith, justification and consecration, when the Gospel-Age Gershonite and Eliezerite Amramites wrote and lectured faithfully on Biblical recensions and other linguistic helps, when the Gospel-Age Zichrite, Nephegite and Korahite Izeharites wrote and lectured faithfully on introductional, interpretational and harmonetical phases of the Bible respectively, when the Gospel-Age Hebronites faithfully wrote and lectured on Biblical history and biography, on Church history and biography and on Biblical geography, archeology and chronology, and when as systematic theologians the Gospel-Age Elzaphanite Uzzielites as dogmaticians, the Mishaelite Uzzielites as ethicians and the Zithrite Uzzielites as apologists, faithfully wrote and lectured on their pertinent subjects, the antitypical Camp was shielded from the pestilences of error that infested it when the above-mentioned writing, preaching and lecturing were not faithfully performed. England from about 1740 to 1840 gives us a splendid illustration of how pestilences of error were kept away from the antitypical Camp during that time. The bulk of that century felt the powerful effect of the Wesleyan priestly movement, which mightily aroused the antitypical Levites to do their work faithfully, with the consequence that many preachers, evangelists and lay workers, as antitypical Gershonites, preached and wrote fruitfully for the antitypical Camp, working in it more interest in God, Christ, the Bible and right living. This effect was not much felt among English antitypical Gershonite Amramites, but was fairly well felt among English Eliezerite Amramites in the way of Bible translation and concordance making (Cruden's and the Englishman's Hebrew and Greek concordances, etc.), among the English Izeharites (Home's Introduction, Patrick, Lowth, Whitby and Arnold's Commentary, William's Cottage Bible, Macknight's and Townsend's Harmonies, etc.), among English Hebronites (Milner's Church History,

etc.) and among the English Uzzielites (Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel History, Butler's Analogy, Paley's Evidences, etc.). They were by their service able to turn away from the English section of the antitypical Camp the pestilence of Deism and keep England in the religiousness of England's nominal-church members.

(93) At the same time in Germany the unfaithfulness of the Levites under the lead of Semler was responsible for the plague of Deism in the form of Rationalism, which for a while almost entirely destroyed the faith of the majority of German people in the Bible and in the Christian religion. But it has been reserved for the Parousia and Epiphany time to furnish the most impressive examples of how the unfaithfulness of the Levites to their work has resulted during the six siftings in the six accompanying plagues devastating the antitypical Camp. During these times increasingly, as Gospel-Age Gershonites, the preachers, evangelists and lay workers have left off preaching, teaching and writing on subjects connected with justification and consecration and have increasingly given their efforts to promote sensationalism, worldliness, reform, social uplift and fighting the Truth. During this time the Gospel-Age Kohathites have increasingly ceased to lecture and write on linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic subjects helpful to the antitypical Camp, mainly leaving such work to the antitypical 12 spies to do. And, consequently, during this time the Gospel-Age Merarites, forced thereto by the comparative unproductiveness of books, etc., by the other two classes of the Levites, have increasingly ceased to edit and print pertinent productions, and have increasingly been either editing and printing the works of the antitypical 12 spies or secular books, mostly novels and other works bereft of, and often inimical to the Christian phase of matters. As a consequence increasingly has the antitypical Camp been plagued by no-ransomism, infidelism, combinationism, reformism,

contradictionism and revolutionism, in the many forms of each of these plagues as they have been afflicting that Camp as God's nominal people.

(94) The last clause of v. 19, "when the children of Israel come nigh unto the sanctuary," refers to the Israelites' taking part in services connected with the Lord, centering in the tabernacle. It brings out the thought of their being in covenant relations with God that required them to use His sanctuary in connection with their approaching to serve Him as their Covenant God. In the antitype this clause suggests the thought of the Camp in its activities toward God, Christ, the Bible, sin, righteousness, repentance and faith; for it is in these respects that the unjustified ones have some slight dealings with these persons and things. And while engaged in such activities they have been helped to keep themselves pleased with God in the sense above described, by the faithful ministries of the Gospel-Age Levites, as when the latter have been unfaithful in their ministries in these activities symbolic plagues have infected the antitypical Camp. Vs. 20-22 simply state as matters of fact how the Lord's charges as to the Levites in the preceding parts of this chapter were carried out. And since we have explained the antitypes in connection with the charges themselves, it would be unnecessary repetition again to go over them.

(95) In the rest of this chapter the period of the Levites' laborious service is set forth. They were to begin the *laborious* part of the Levite service at the age of 25 (v. 24) and cease from it at the age of 50. The word translated *"service"* in vs. 24, 25 and 26, and the word translated *"serve"* in v. 25, refer to the laborious work connected with the tabernacle. The performance of the harder parts of the Levite work, like carrying heavy parts of the tabernacle, etc., is thereby meant. While the Levites beyond 50 years were not to take part in such laborious service, they could do lighter works connected with the tabernacle, as well as teach

the people of the camp their duties and privileges connected with the tabernacle, which lighter works are what are meant by the expression, "shall *minister* with their brethren in the tabernacle of the congregation, to keep the charge." At first sight there seems to be a contradiction between the age 25 years—that v. 24 gives, and the age—30 years—that Num. 4: 3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47 give, as that at which Levites were to begin their "service." We harmonize the apparent discrepancy as follows: At 25 years the Levites started to be trained as helpers, or apprentices, of the full serving Levites, and at 30 years their apprenticeship ceased and they became full-fledged laborious Levites. Vs. 24 and 25 give the full period of the apprenticeship and laborious service, while the verses in Num. 4 give only the period of the laborious service.

(96) There are some interesting antitypes of vs. 24-26. The fact that no Levite could begin the Levite tabernacle service in any sense before 25 years of age types the fact that the immature faith-justified should not be given work to do in the Lord's service in an official way before entering into the necessary preliminary training required by the pertinent office. This applies to the Gospel-Age Gershonites as preachers, evangelists and lay workers, to the Gospel-Age Kohathites as scholars writing and lecturing on linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic lines, and to the Gospel-Age Merarites as editors and publishers of the writings of Gospel-Age Gershonites and Kohathites. Otherwise they would commit serious blunders, hurtful to all concerned. That the Levites had to undergo a five-year training as apprentices and helpers of the full-fledged laboring Levites before they could become of the latter kind of Levites, types the fact that a generous amount of time, fully sufficient for their proper training, had to be devoted by the justified to their preparation for the heavy service required officially from the justified preachers, evangelists and lay workers,

as Gospel-Age Gershonites, from the justified writers and lecturers on linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic subjects, as Gospel-Age Kohathites, and from the justified editors and publishers of the works of the other Levites, as Gospel-Age Merarites. Usually a man's powers are at their best between 30 and 50 years of age, for which reason God fixed those years as the years for the laborious work of the Levites. Their beginning to be full-fledged laboring Levites at 30 years of age, at which age one's powers come to their best, when they finished their training, types the fact that the responsible official service of all three classes of Gospel-Age Levites should be undertaken by them only when their powers come to their best, after their preliminary training is complete for their respective forms of service. Their continuing to serve for the 20 years in which a man's powers ordinarily are at their best types the fact that the heavy work of the Gospel-Age Levites is to be done by those only who are at their best, not in natural age, of course, but in the needed abilities and attainments.

(97) The Levites' ceasing from the laborious service at 50 years of age types the fact that none of the Gospel-Age Levites should attempt to do, or be encouraged to do, work that is beyond their abilities and attainments. Their still performing lighter work about the tabernacle and teaching the people after they were beyond 50 years of age types the fact that, though the abilities of the Gospel-Age Levites are for certain official Levitical work decaying, they are nevertheless to do such service for the Priests and people as they are able to do in their declining condition. The increasing disabilities of the Levites as they continued to advance in years beyond 50 requiring an ever lightening of their work in order to "fit the burdens to the backs," types the fact that as the abilities of the three classes of Gospel-Age Levites decrease with time, sickness, poverty, etc., etc., their responsibilities in the service of the

Lord are to decrease. A Levite becoming totally disabled from service by disease or senility would type those Gospel-Age Levites whose talents have become unavailable for any form of service—one who ceased being a Gospel-Age Levite altogether, by reason of sin or error. The variations of abilities in the Levites to serve either the tabernacle or the people, would type the fact that individuals in all classes of Gospel-Age Levites have differed greatly in their abilities for Gospel-Age Levite work. Of these some have been more able and efficient preachers, evangelists and lay workers than others; some have been more able and efficient writers and lecturers on Biblical linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic subjects than others; and some have been more able editors and publishers of the formers' writings than others. And it is for this reason that, just as the Lord makes different uses of various Priests, dependent on their varying talents, providential situation and their spirit of consecration, so has He made different uses of the various Gospel-Age Levites in their various groups, dependent on their various talents, providential situations and spirit of faith and righteousness.

(98) The last sentence of v. 26, "Thus shalt thou do unto the Levites touching their charge," emphasizes by repetition the charges given in vs. 24-26. It served to impress upon Moses the duty of doing these things toward the Levites as to the time of their beginning the training for their laborious service, the time of actual entrance into it, during its duration and the time of cessation from that laborious service and entering into easier work. Such emphasis served to make Moses all the more careful to see to the enactment of the pertinent matters just as God commanded, and such fulfillment of the Lord's charge by Moses served to the best interests of the Priests and the people, as well as to the Levites themselves. This types the fact that Jehovah impressed it upon our Lord to see to it that the anti

types were carried out in all the above-indicated details. Moses' performing the type properly types our Lord's properly putting the details of the antitype into fulfilment, which has resulted in blessing to the antitypical Priests and Camp, as well as to the Gospel-Age Levites themselves.

(1) Of how many classes have God's professed people consisted during the Gospel-Age? What are these? What two sets of types figured this forth in these classes? What does the type of a fleshly Israel imply? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? Whereby, especially, has this been shown in these columns? To what studies do we return in this article? What is the subject of this article? On what Scripture is this study based? How should we approach it? Why?

(2) Where were our last studies in Numbers? What were their subjects? How far in our study of Numbers did they bring us? Which sets of Levites are we not studying in this chapter? Why not? What does this move us to do with them? To what set of Levites will we limit this study? Why study these? Of what is this study intended to assure us? How many sets of Levitical antitypes are there?

(3) What kind of proof has been given before on the Gospel-Age Levites? As such, what kind of Levites are they? Who in the finished Gospel-Age picture are the Levites? In the meantime what do the facts prove? Into how many parts will our study be divided? What are they? In what part of Num. 8 is the command of their cleansing set forth? Of their consecration? Of the carrying out of these commands? What will a careful study of Num. 8: 5-26 bring to light? What does v. 5 show? Who did-not originate this service? Who was its sole originator? What two things prove this?

(4) What two charges does God give Moses in v. 6? Whom do God and Moses therein represent? What do they respectively type in the pertinent activities? In general, by what did antitypical Moses sever the antitypes? In what five ways did He do this? What kind of persons does the Camp, represent? What three acts are implied in the widest sense of the word *sever*? To what sense of this word do the words of v. 6 apply?

(5) In what senses is the word *cleansing* Biblically used? What does it include in its wide sense combinedly? In its narrow sense distributedly? Under what term is the second narrow sense covered in v. 12? Where are these senses combined in the wide sense? What does v. 7 directly describe? How manifold is the cleansing process? What is the first? Second? Third? What do these three complete? What is the character of these three things?

(6) What is the relation of the waters of purifying and separation? How is this Scripturally proven? What is the Hebrew word translated *purification* in v. 7? What are its five meanings in Hebrew? What Scriptures prove this? Which of these five meanings apply in Num. 8: 7; 19: 9, 17? Where does our Pastor treat of these waters? What do they type? For what is the antitype useful? What does Num. 19: 11-22 teach was the typical use of these waters? Whom do the dead of these verses type? What is represented by being in their presence? By touching them? By the ashes of the red heifer? By the living water? What illustrates this? What does the mingling of the ashes and water represent? The vessel that contained them, as applied to the above example? To what else do these definitions apply? From what in sin do such teachings cleanse? From what in sin do not they, but something else cleanse?

(7) For what do these considerations prepare us? What does God's charge to Moses as to the sprinkling of the Levites type? How many forms of truths are implied in the antitypical sprinkling? What are these kinds? How many kinds are the typical truths? What are they? What does each one imply? What are some examples of those furnishing such truths? How many kinds are the antitypical truths? What are they? What does each one imply? For what would both kinds serve in the antitype? What does the sprinkling type? What has our Lord seen to on this head throughout the Gospel-Age? Why?

(8) What stories were, accordingly, told the prospective faith-justified? What was given in connection with them? Give illustrations of such. In what were these things taught the prospective faith-justified? What agents did our Lord use to do this work? What resulted therefrom? What

three ends did such instruction serve? What did these three purposes serve? What resulted therefrom? What general work did the sprinkling further? Why? What are parts of repentance? What is the function of repentance?

(9) By what language of v. 7 is the second cleansing process set forth? What is the literal translation of this part of v. 7? What does the razor represent? In what two senses does the razor imply the Law? Prove this. How many forms has the Law had? What will its other form have? What is a Scriptural function of the Law? Prove it Scripturally. What does it first do to accomplish this? What does it secondly do to accomplish this? In what two ways does it accomplish the first of these? The second of these? What, besides the revealed Law, assists in such works? What does the Law thus do with honest hearts?

(10) What other thing does the Law do? On this what does it do with responsive hearts? What does this first arouse in their hearts? Why? What does it next arouse in them? What desire does it raise in them? What two things does it work in them as a result of the foregoing effects? In what does this result? What does it stir up in them? What does the Law then do? Why? What can it not give man? What must do this? What, then, is the Law's limitation in the process of bringing people to Christ?

(11) What is not antitypical Moses' part with the razor? What does He do with it? Of what two kinds are His agents therein? What are the priestly agents so used? What are the Levitical agents so used? What are the inanimate agents so used? What books have specially helped therein? To what two kinds of denominations have the pertinent Levites belonged? What are the examples of each of these two kinds of denominations? What, as a rule, was the means by which the ritualistic denominations gave the razor? The non-ritualistic denominations? What conclusion should not be drawn from these facts? Who did make a proper use of one or the other of these methods? Under what other circumstance did some receive the razor?

(12) How did these agents hand the razor to the prospective faith-justified? What does this imply? With what did they thereby acquaint them? What did this reveal to them? What was a mirror in this transaction? What two forms of sinfulness did this reveal to them? What did they

thereby see? In a few words, what did this give them? What did they thereby announce to them? Into what did some of these agents exaggerate the penalty of sin? With what result to many? What did our Lord do about this? What further effects did the handing of the razor work out? Summarize the effects of handing the razor. What condition of heart did these things effect?

(13) What did these agents not do? Who did this? What was preliminary to the shaving? What does seeing the antitypical razor represent? What does reaching out the symbolic hand and receiving the razor represent? What else did receiving it represent? What, finally, did it type? What does hair symbolize? How is this proved? What are sins in this connection? What must be done with such powers? What on this head does repentance effect? By what means does the sinner sever from himself such powers? What does shaving represent? What is the pertinent part of repentance? What is typed by the expression, "all his flesh"? What combination works repentance? What are the ingredients of repentance? How many of these are effected by the antitypical waters of separation and the razor?

(14) By what is the last of these ingredients worked? What do clothes type? For what especially are natural and symbolic clothes worn? Prove this of the latter. Explain St. Peter's thoughts on this figure? St. Paul's? What are spots and dirt on these garments? Prove this. How are we when these are removed from our symbolic garments? Explain the pertinent Scriptures. How were our Lord's symbolic garments? Prove this Scripturally. What is the symbolic water for cleansing symbolic garments? Prove this to be Biblical. What do these figures enable us to understand? What is symbolized by the Levites' washing their clothes? What vestiges do prospective Gospel-Age Levites have? By what are these contaminated? By what must they be removed? How is this accomplished? What parts of the Word are generally used therein? What does this mean? What is completed by a right washing of these symbolic clothes?

(15) From what two typical standpoints is repentance set forth? What are the Greek words for *repentance* and *to repent*? What are their literal meanings? What do these literal meanings import? What does its mental change import?

Its moral change? Its religious change? What is inseparably implied in it? Why? With what is true repentance freighted? What does the Bible call such a grief?

(16) What are the parts of repentance as to sin? Give Scripture proof for each. What are the parts of repentance as to righteousness? Give Scripture proof for each. What are the two features of repentance? How many parts does its sin feature have? Its righteousness feature? From what two sources do we know this? How is it related to justification? What must be added to it to reach justification?

(17) Give an analysis of the Scriptures in which the verb *metanoein*, *to repent*, occurs. Give an analysis of the Scriptures in which the noun *metanoia*, *repentance*, occurs.

(18) Wherewith was this chapter begun? What part of Num. 8 was studied above? What do these three verses bring to light? What special work was therein described? By what were the pertinent persons prepared therefore? How many processes does v. 7 show to bring sinners to repentance? What are they? By the co-operation of what two sets of activities is repentance brought to a completion? What else is necessary to accomplish repentance? What kind of persons are needed, if the three processes of v. 7 are to effect repentance? Why should we expect these processes to be sufficient for their purpose? What may we say with respect to all His works?

(19) What is the cleansing limit of repentance? From what can it not cleanse? What only can do this? How is this put in one of our finest hymns? Of what would one fall short, if one goes no further than repentance? What cannot work our complete cleansing? Why not? What is the limit of its work in cleansing? What helps us out of our otherwise helpless condition? What have these provided? What does the Law not offer us? What can it not work in us? Why not? What can and does accomplish this? Where in Num. 8 is its ability brought to our attention? Wherein is the Law feature of God's Word active, according to v. 7? For what does God have it preached and applied? What is the next thing to be expected as a thing to be taught and applied? Where is this done? As what is the Gospel typically brought to our attention in v. 8? In what way is it put in v. 8? What is needed to understand the connection between vs. 7 and 8 and how Truth preaching is shown in v. 8?

(20) How many typical sacrifices are set forth in v. 8? What are they? Where is the first-mentioned bullock not called a burnt-offering? Where is it so called? What is the second bullock not called? Why not? What is it called? Why so? What Scriptures prove our Lord the antitypical Bullock? How do they do this? What conclusion is to be drawn from these proofs? Show how certain other Scriptures corroborate this proof? Where has this been ably presented? What conclusion may we, therefore, draw from v. 8? Why should we from this connection keep this thought in mind?

(21) What other kind of a bullock is brought to our attention in v. 8? From this what are we not to understand? How many sacrifices did our Lord make of Himself? Prove it. How in this did the typical and antitypical bullocks differ? If not another sacrifice, what does this burnt-offering typify? Read the corroboration from Tabernacle Shadows. How do we know that the burnt-offering represents God's manifested acceptance of the sacrifice? What five examples prove this? What about four of them manifested the acceptance?

(22) What is the character of the manifested acceptance in the antitype? Why is this? How will it be in the Millennium? How is it done in connection with the Church during the Gospel-Age? To which of these does v. 8 refer antitypically? To what does it refer? How is it done in connection with the justified during the Gospel-Age? For what will the right answer be helpful? In how many ways was it manifested? What was the first of these? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? For what purpose did the last three not serve? For what purpose did they serve? For what purpose did the first three of these serve? How do we know this?

(23) To understand the exact force of the sin- and burnt-offerings in v. 8, what must be understood? Where do we find the nature of the meat-offering set forth? What is it there said to represent? What does praising Jehovah mean? What illustrates this? What two meanings does the word *worship* have? Which one of these is usually not recognized to be meant by worship? What notable words of Christ prove one of its meanings? What other passages prove the same thing? How does each one of them do so?

How, then, is the antitypical meat-offering made? How may this be more briefly stated? How does the type imply this meaning in the antitype? What aspect of the antitypical sacrifice is brought to our attention by the meat-offering?

(24) What might here be profitably discussed? How so? What is not represented by each different form of the typical sacrifices? What is thereby represented? What antitypical forms of sacrifice were in our Lord's sacrifice? What does this not mean? Why not? In general how are they related to His one sacrifice? What aspect of it is brought out by His sin-offering? By His burnt-offering? His meat-offering? His peace-offering? His free-will offering? His thank-offering? His praise-offering? Whose one sacrifice has the same seven phases? By what are these brought out? In a summary, what do they not, and what do they type? With what other antitypes are certain of them associated?

(25) For what do the above remarks prepare us? What will such an understanding bring to us? What antitype does the meat-offering of v. 8 suggest? What limitation to such preaching is suggested by the meat-offering being associated with the sin-offering? With the burnt-offering How does God manifest His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice connected with the stage of matters set forth in v. 8? What preaching is symbolized in v. 8? What is the connection between vs. 7 and 8? What does the antitype thus show? What have the experiences of the justified to say on this view of events? Those of the reminiscent consecrated? What does this do to our exposition of vs. 7 and 8? What do the cited Scriptures do with it?

(26) Why should we examine this matter more closely? What did God's agents do after the antitypes of v. 7 were enacted? What was the first thing that such preaching set forth? Read and explain the Scriptures proving this. What great sacrifice did God's love prompt Him to make for the world, according to such preaching? Read and explain the Scriptures that prove this. What fact pertinent to Christ's character did such preaching declare? Read and explain the corroborative Scriptures. What fitness was there in Christ, according to such preaching? Read and expound the pertinent passages. What related fact did such preaching set forth? Read and explain the probative passages

thereon. What did such preaching set forth as the working of such a sin-offering? Prove this by each of the pertinent cited Scriptures. What do Pentecostal and post-Pentecostal facts show as to such preaching?

(27) What are not included in our foregoing description of the sin-offering? Why not? Wherein are they typed? Why so? How many and what are these acts? Whose acts exclusively are they? Why? Of what acts does justification consist? What follows on God's doing these two things? What are we not to understand the taking of the sin-offering in v. 8 to type? Why not? What does it type? What else prove this? What does the bringing of the burnt-offering in v. 8 not mean? What does it mean? What must the preaching of the thoughts of the antitypical burnt-offering precede in each individual case? Why? To what, therefore, does v. 8 exclusively refer? Of what does it not treat? How is this typically shown?

(28) What matter of fact and Scripture have we seen above? What other thing is susceptible of the same kind of proofs? What language of v. 8 proves this typically? Of what did the meat-offering consist? What does its fine flour type? Its oil? What are the first and second truths presented in the presentation of the antitypical burnt-and meat-offerings? What acts of God's do these two truths describe? What do these two things do for the sinner as to God's Law? How is this so? What third thing flows naturally from these two things? What do these three acts prove as to God's attitude toward Christ's sacrifice?

(29) What does the Bible teach that God's forgiving sins proves? Read and show this from the cited Scriptures. How is the declaration of the forgiveness of sins related to the Gospel message? What Scriptures prove this and how? Who at first preached this message? Who since? What do our experiences teach on this point? What conclusion may we draw from these considerations?

(30) What further thing in this connection do we know from Scripture and experience? What does the Bible teach as to this further thing? Why must we have Christ's righteousness imputed to us? What fact proves this? How only can we fulfill the Law's demands as to obedience? What line of passages gives the first proof of this? Show this in each passage. What line of passages gives the second proof

of this? Show this in each passage. How could Christ's righteousness not be made ours instantly? How instantly? How will it be made the world's in the Millennium? How is this proved? How does it become ours in justification? Who first preached it to the penitent? Who since? How do we know it? What conclusion should we draw from this?

(31) What is the third feature of the antitypical burnt-offering connected with justification? What has been done with it throughout the Gospel-Age? What is sin as to God? What does it effect in one as to God and Satan? What results therefrom in God? How does God act as a result? How then does the sinner become to God? Read the pertinent Scriptures and prove this thought. What is one of the keenest sorrows of remorse? Read the pertinent Scriptures and show this from them. What is one of the ways—the third—whereby God shows that He accepts Christ's sacrifice? Read the pertinent Scriptures and show this thought from them. By whom was this first preached? What passages prove this? How do they do it? By whom has it since been done? What else proves it? What do we from the above discussion, accordingly, see on this point? On all the pertinent points?

(32) What thoughts should again be stressed as to v. 8? What does it not describe? To what thoughts does it limit itself? Where is the working of faith stressed in this chapter? What conviction is wrought on our minds and hearts by our present study? What considerations work it? What does this do with our Pastor's teaching on tentative justification? What should our feasting on vs. 5-8 effect in us? Why have so many Scriptures been quoted in this chapter? How are faith justification and its related truths to be regarded as to subsequent truths? What is the relation of these truths to the Biblical stress laid on them?

(33) What would the thought connection between vs. 8 and 12 naturally make us expect? For what reasons is this natural expectation not satisfied? What is one of the thoughts brought out in vs. 9-11? What does v. 9 especially show? How is this shown in the first clause of v. 9? Show from the cited Scriptures that the true Church is the antitypical Temple and Tabernacle. How is the thought of publicity brought out in the second clause of v. 9? What, therefore, did God desire to mark the transactions with the Levites?

(34) How many things are done in the type and antitype of Num. 8 to the Levites? How do we not, and how do we use the word *Levites* in this connection? What three things had to be done to carry out the transaction of making the non-priestly descendants of Levi a sacred tribe? How did all three of these acts have to be done? How does the type bring out this feature of the three acts? How must the antitypes of these three acts be done? Before what two classes did both type and antitype have to be performed? In what kinds of churches were these antitypes enacted? How? Of whom did they consist? Until when did this continue before the real Church?

(35) By what two methods of training mainly were responsive sinners won in the ritualistic churches? In what did this result for the catechumen? Why was this? By what was this more impressively done? How many ecclesia members were present at such a service? What did not all confirmants experience? Who only of them experienced it? How were these in their confirmation regarded? By what two classes in the ecclesias? What did they in this service publicly confess? Who thereby really brought them into publicity before the real and nominal Church? In what other churches was the same thing done in principle? With what difference? In such churches what were the main forms of persuasion? What other things were thereto used in both kinds of churches? Which were the main ones used there? Wherein did they agree and differ as to main methods of training? By whom was the preaching mainly done? How were such preaching services attended? Who were publicly seen as such? By whom? What does this prove? How was publicity given those who came in a private way to justification? What will we do with the publicity of the acts typed in vs. 11 and 13? What is all that need here be mentioned?

(36) How many important items are brought to our attention in v. 10? What is the first of these? How do some misunderstand the expression, to bring or present one before the Lord? On what passages was this meaning foisted by The Tower? For what purpose? What is not necessary for being in God's presence? Why not? Prove from the cited passages that the expressions, to bring and to present one before God, or to be before God, do not mean, to be in God's throne room, so to speak. What do these expressions

mean? How does this meaning apply in v. 10? How does it apply to the antitypical Levites? How is this seen in each one of the four stages of Leviteship? Accordingly, what does the first charge of v. 10 antitypically mean?

(37) What is the second item of v. 10? How many symbolic meanings does the Bible give to the expression, laying on of hands? What is the first of these? What is the first fact that proves it? What is the second fact that proves this? What is the second symbolic meaning of the expression? Prove this from four Scriptures. What is the third symbolic meaning of this expression?

(38) Why is the first of these meanings not applicable in v. 10? How is Aaron's atonement bullock related to the thought of *representation?* By what, however, is this not symbolized in connection with the bullock? Why not? Why can the second definition not be applied in v. 10? Prove this Biblically. Which definition must, therefore, apply? What is it? What, accordingly, is symbolized by the Israelites' laying hands on the Levites What does it type? What does it type in the experience of the Levites as to their faith and justification? As to their public confession in any form? What was our experience in these three respects? Amid what acts was it undergone?

(39) In what other stages was this endorsement shown? What was one of these? Whom do the Gershonites as Libnites and as Shimites represent? As what was antitypical Libnite Gershonite work done? What was necessary to do such work? By what was such preparation given? How did the nominal Christians endorse the antitypical Libnites' undergoing such preparation? How did they finally lay hands on the antitypical Libnites? What illustrations clarify this? How, as a rule, did they do this? How was their laying hands on the Shimites done, comparatively considered? What was the antitypical Shimites' work? By whom and how was this work usually done? How did the antitypical Israelites "lay hands on them"?

(40) What on this head has been so far shown? On whom else did they lay hands? Whom did the Mushite Merarites represent? Whom did the Mahlite Merarites represent? How did the antitypical Israelites lay hands on the antitypical Mushites? On the Mahlites? What other family of antitypical Levites did they so treat? What

kind of lectures and writings did the antitypical Amramites furnish? The antitypical Izeharites? The antitypical Hebronites? The antitypical Uzzielites? How did the antitypical Israelites lay hands on these? What is a summary of the antitype of the second clause of v. 10?

(41) What can we now properly recognize? What is the first reason for putting vs. 9-11 where they are? What fact does not set this aside? What is the second reason for it? How does the study of Num. 8: 5-10 effect us? Why?

(42) How far has our study of Num. 8 brought us? What, according to the margin, is the proper translation of v. 11? The explanation of what two kinds of sacrifices was overlooked in par. (24) of our present chapter? What did the wave-offering at the priests' consecration type? What does the heave-offering type? What does the wave-offering of v. 11 not type? Whose is it? By whom is it made? Who in v. 13 makes a wave-offering? What should the two wave-offerings suggest as to the antitype? How many of them are in the antitype? How is the account placed in relation to the account of the Levites' justification? Where is the latter treated? Why are vs. 9-11 set between vs. 8 and 12? How are the things typed by v. 11 related to the things typed in v. 12? What effect does this have on placing v. 11 where it is? By what will this appear?

(43) What is the antitype of Aaron's waving the Levites as a wave-offering? What does Aaron here type? What does the waving of the Levites type? What is typed by its being done unto or before the Lord? How is the purpose of this wave-offering set forth in v. 11? From what, treated of in v. 13, does it differ? What three facts enable us to see the antitype? What is implied in Christ's waving them as a wave-offering *from the antitypical children of Israel*?

(44) What will clarify the antitypes of v. 11? In what respects were the Gospel-Age Levites prepared? Where did this preparation antitypically begin? How did the preaching typed in v. 8 affect it? What previous remark was based on the preparatory work implied in v. 8? How does this affect the relative position of v. 11? What are set forth in v. 12? In what other verses is this preparatory

work set forth? Why so? What bearing have these facts on the position of v. 11?

(45) When does this preparation mainly take place? Wherein does this preparation differ? Wherein does their heart's preparation consist? In what did they thereby progress? How long did they develop in heart qualities? In what did it result? When it became all-controlling what resulted? What did their Levitical preparation not imply? What did it imply? What conditioned the degree of such preparation? How does this become apparent? What example illustrates this?

(46) What kind was the foregoing preparation? What resulted therefrom? What was the clearest expression of Levitical preparation? What was the duration, *e.g.*, of that of the pastoral Gospel-Age Gershonites? What institutions did they usually attend? In college what course did they usually take? What languages especially did they study? What other branches? What four departments of theology did they usually study? What were the branches of systematic theology studied by them? Of exegetical theology? Of historical theology? Of practical theology? How were they helped to apply their knowledge in practice before entering the ministry? How was this preparation given where there were no colleges and seminaries? How were missionaries prepared? How were lay Gershonites prepared for their work? How were the antitypical Shimites prepared usually? What almost always characterized the preparation of the Gospel-Age Gershonites? How was this typed in the twofold participants in their preparation?

(47) What second class of Levites was also waved? What are the two classes of the antitypical Merarites? What was the antitypical waving for the publishers? What features did it imply? Through what spheres of work, as a rule, did they pass? What branch of the antitypical Merarites was covered thereby? What other branch of them underwent this preparation? What did it presuppose of them, especially of some of them? Where were they prepared? What was the character of some of their notes? What other things did they sometimes supply? What was the value of some of these? What was a necessary preliminary to such work? What other

group of antitypical Mahlites had to undergo preparation? How was our Lord related to it?

(48) Which of the Gospel-Age Levites had to undergo the most careful preparation? Why? What had they usually been? What had some of them exceptionally been? Who were noted exceptions to this rule? What training, as a rule, did they undergo? What four kinds of works did they produce? What did this imply? How did they undergo it? Why was this? In what two ways did they work? What have the Gospel-Age Kohathites been among the Levites? To whom have their pen products been most helpful? Of what was their long-drawn-out preparation the antitype? How was our Lord's part therein typed? The nominal people's part? And God's part? How was this shown in the type?

(49) What comes next in our study? How does v. 12 compare in contents with the other verses of Num. 8? Why? What has already been sufficiently proved as to v. 12? How does its first clause read? As respects the bullock of the sin-offering, what do these words type? What does the Bible teach as to Jesus and substitution? Read the passages cited and prove this from them. In what two ways do these passages prove substitution? By those directly teaching substitution what is proven of the others? How so? How is such substitution typed?

(50) What is typed by the Levites' leaning their hands on the bullock of the sin-offering? What is the relation between representation and substitution? What proves this? What is implied in laying hands on a substitute? What is, therefore, typed in general by the Levites' laying hands on the sin-offering? What is in particular thereby typed? What is in general typed by their laying hands on the burnt-offering? What in particular is thereby typed? Please sum up the antitypes.

(51) What is the literal rendering of the word translated, *shall lay*? Why should it be here emphasized? What may faith symbolically be called? Why? What is the greatest grace? What is now the most important grace? Why? In what action is its leaning character especially marked? What is our Pastor's definition of it? How do the cited Scriptures prove this definition? How is it wrought? How do the Scriptures prove this? What are

faith's basis and superstructure? What are the ingredients of this foundation? Superstructure? Read and explain the Scriptures proving these things. What does a justifying faith do with these two features of faith? Toward whom? Read and show this from the cited passages. Toward whom does faith also exercise these two features in justification? In what three ways? Read and show this from the cited passages? Sum up faith's activity in these two features Christward and Godward. Whereby is all of this typed?

(52) What next is in v. 12 brought to our attention? Who would we naturally think would receive this charge? Who actually received it? What is shown on this point in v. 21? How is this matter harmonized in the type? In the antitype? Why are Aaron and Moses joined in these offerings? What three facts are proved by these considerations?

(53) What are we not to understand to be typed by the offering of the sin-offering in v. 12? Why not? How is Christ's sacrifice of Himself chronologically related to the repentant sinner's exercising faith? What, then, is typed by Moses and Aaron offering the sin-offering to God in v. 12? What kind of acts are not typed thereby? What kind are typed thereby? What proves this view? What does it enable us to see? What was our Pastor's earlier view as to when the ransom was paid, reconciliation Godward was made? His later full view on the pertinent matters? What Scriptures prove the later view to be correct? What does this type do with tentative justification? What should we think and do as to this type?

(54) What four classes prove tentative justification? Who are the tentatively justified? For whom could not the merit of Christ have been actually imputed? Why? Whose tentative justification does this imply? Who else must have a tentative justification? How does Rom. 4: 3-8 prove this doctrine? What is the difference between tentative and vitalized justification? Read and show how the cited passages prove vitalized justification. Read and prove this by the cited passages treating of *believing into*. Read and prove from the cited passages treating of *believing on*, or *upon*, that the Bible treats of tentative justification.

(55) Where are these justifications performed? To which of these does Heb. 9: 24 refer? Why? What does it imply without directly teaching it? How do Rom. 3: 25 and 22 prove tentative justification to take place in heaven also? Where are both performed? According to Heb. 1: 3, what kind of an imputation was made on Christ's ascension? Whom did this not affect? When have individual imputations been made? Of what two kinds? Like what other distinction is the one here made? By what is that other distinction proved? At what other times are reckoned or actual imputations made for individuals? What does v. 12 imply on this subject?

(56) How has Christ made these imputations? What preliminary work did He do thereto? What is a justifying faith? What does Jesus do as soon as it is wrought? What does God thereupon do? Why is one only tentatively justified? Under what other circumstances does Jesus only reckonedly impute His merit? What does God then do? What do these things make God and Christ as to tentative justification?

(57) How has our Lord been actually imputing His merit? What kind of a justification does this effect? What are Jesus' acts in vitalizing one's justification? What are God's acts in vitalizing one's justification? What does vitalizing justification accomplish? What results therefiom as to the Adamic death? What happens with later sins repented of? Why, from Christ's and God's pertinent activities? What does this prevent and effect? Why is vitalized justification not referred to in v. 12? Why has it been briefly discussed here?

(58) What two things does v 12 charge Moses to do? What does his doing the first of these type? In general, what does his doing the second of these type? What in paragraph (12) did we see was not, and what was, typed by Moses' offering the sin-offering? What works of Jesus are the antitypes of Moses' offering the burnt-offering? What did He thereby accomplish?

(59) On this subject what can we as consecrated believers testify? By whom and what did Jesus minister the pertinent teachings to us? What can we recall thereon? How do we think of them? What effects therein wrought can we recall? What else in this connection can

we recall? What forms did these providences take? Who was active in all of them? Why so? What type did He thereby fulfill? For whom else did He do the same things?

(60) What does the last clause of v. 12 teach? What does this type? Who is the agent of the atonement? How is this proved by the cited passages? Who is the source of the atonement? How is this proved by the cited passages? What does the word *reconciliation* presuppose? What does it mean? In the present case, who are the parties at variance? How are they so? As the source of the atonement, what seven things has the Father undertaken? What kind of a work do parts (1), (2) and (3) perform in the atonement proper? How are parts (4) to (7) related to the atonement? How is part (2) related to the atonement? What parts show this?

(61) How is Christ's death related to the atonement? How do the cited passages prove this? What did He do with the seven parts of the atonement work? In which of them passively? Actively? What has He been in all seven of them? What have been assistants therein? What were the persons acting as such, among two classes of God's people? What part in the atonement work did the offering of the sin-offering in v. 12 have? What part did the offering of the bullock of the burnt-offering in v. 12 have? What part of v. 12 brings this out typically? What has our study of v. 12 effected? What does this verse do with the charges of Num. 8: 6-12?

(62) What does v. 13 give? How many were these charges? What was the first? The second? What does the expression, to stand before one, when used of an official, mean? How do the cited passages prove this? What does the first charge mean? What does the second charge mean? Why is no mention made of a charge to place the Levites before Israel? How did their service of the Israelites stand related to their service of God and the Aaronic priesthood? What did the completion of the cleansing and consecration of the Levites complete? What was thereafter lawful for them to do? According to v. 14, what accomplished the separation of the Levites from the Israelites and made them the Lord's Levites?

(63) What do Aaron, his sons and Moses type in v. 13?

What is typed by Moses' setting the Levites before Aaron and his sons? Why was the Gospel-Age Levitical office created? How were the Gospel-Age Gershonites to serve the Priesthood? In how many ways did they serve it? What were these? What three things did their setting before the Priesthood imply?

(64) How were the Gospel-Age Merarites to serve the Priesthood? In how many ways did they serve it? What were these? What three things did their setting before the Priesthood imply? How were the Gospel-Age Kohathites to serve the Priesthood? In how many ways? What were they? What three things did their setting before the Priesthood imply? In a word, what did the setting of the Levites before Aaron and his sons type?

(65) What marks the acts whereby this was done? What acts usually constituted the setting before Aaron and his sons of those Gershonites who became ministers, evangelists and missionaries? How did the Shimites differ in this from the Libnites? How were those Libnites thus set who were Sunday-school superintendents and teachers, lay preachers and evangelists and catechists? How was this done as to unofficial lay workers among the antitypical Libnites and Shimites? How were Gospel-Age Merarites inducted into their office in their two classes? How were the four classes of Gospel-Age Kohathites inducted into their office? Why so?

(66) What was the final typical act in the cleansing and consecration of the Levites? What did this act do with them as to God? What is thereby typed? For what were not, and for what were Gospel-Age Levites consecrated? How has this act been performed so far as our sight has been concerned? How have we learned of it? What does the waving of the Gospel-Age Levites further imply? What does this mean? In what two ways could this rightly be done? What two things were still further implied in this waving? What does this imply as to the former implication? What would a backsliding Levite do with his consecration? Of what is v. 14 a summary? As a result, how do we treat it?

(67) What have we in the preceding sections of this chapter studied? Of what did vs. 5-14 consist? Of what do vs. 16-26 mainly consist? In what connection were the

antitypes of the narratives in vs. 16-26 given? What effect will this have on our study of the second half of Num. 8? Whose antitypes will be considered in the rest of the chapter?

(68) What does the opening clause of v. 15 show? How was it in the antitype of this? For what did the Gospel-Age Levites have to wait before serving? As what did they serve? By what is this typed? What might be the first impression as to the meaning of the second and third clauses of v. 15? What three considerations suggest another thought? To what cleansing and waving do these two clauses of v. 15 refer? What are their antitypes?

(69) What are we not to understand to be the character of the cleansing preceding the consecration of the Gospel-Age Levites? What reasoning implies this? In what two forms did this cleansing manifest itself? What did their actual cleansing not accomplish? What did it accomplish? With what was it accompanied? Of what kinds of sins did this make them guilty? From what has it been necessary to cleanse them? Who assisted them therein? How long did He do this? By what two things can this be proved? What does our experience testify thereon? Of what was our Lord's pertinent work the antitypical fulfillment? How did He perform this work? What did He thereby do and accomplish? What would have resulted if He had not so acted? What final result came from these acts of His? What should this move us to do? To whom? In what respects?

(70) What did the charge of v. 15, to wave the Levites, imply as to Moses? What would otherwise have occurred? What did this antitype? As to the antitypical Gershonites? Merarites? Kohathites? What has our Lord additionally done to them? How long did He not do this? How long did He do this? What else did He assist them to do? By what two methods of proof do we know this? How did Jesus act toward the last charge of v. 16?

(71) On what is Rotherham's translation of v. 16 based? How did he render it? In the type how many sets of persons were there constituting the firstborn and the tribe of Levi? The antitypical firstborn and tribe of Levi? How were the two typical sets not used? How were they used? What is brought out in the typical firstborns of the antitypical

firstborn? What antitypically is brought out by the typical tribe of Levi? How are other offices brought out in the antitype by types? From the standpoint of the finished picture, how many relations do the Gospel-Age firstborn sustain? What are they? How many classes of firstborns are in both of these relations? What are they? What is meant by the tentative firstborn? In each class? What is meant by the final firstborn? How are the Youthful Worthies to be regarded from this standpoint now? Both classes of Worthies in the next Age? When will they be final Levites? When do they come into existence? Why is it necessary to keep the above distinctions in mind?

(72) What kind of an expression is, "given, given?" What is another similar one? Why are such expressions used? In whose place were the Levites chosen? Where is this narrated and explained? What correction should here be made? What should be said of Rotherham's rendering of parts of v. 16? Why is he here to be preferred to the A. V.? How do his notes render it? His text? Why the change?

(73) What is taught by the emphasis of this verse? What are all the ways of emphasis given this thought in this verse? What does this mean in the antitype? What does this emphasis imply for the antitype? What would faithfulness in the Gospel-Age Levites bring them? In the Priests? What would unfaithfulness in the Gospel-Age Levites bring them? In the Priests?

(74) What does v. 17 explain? In what connection did this occur? Explain the pertinent typical events? What did each Israelite's house represent? The door? The lintels and posts? The lamb? The blood? Its sprinkling? The remaining in the blood-protected houses? How was this related to the tentative firstborn? To the final firstborn? What resulted finally with the tentative firstborn? What do the firstborn of man in the finished picture represent? Of beast? What do Israel's firstborn of man represent in the finished picture? Of beast? Egypt's firstborn of man? Of beast? By what were the firstborn spared? What did this blood do for them? In what did this result Godward? When? How could God justly exchange the firstborn for the Levites?

(75) What is the literal translation of the first clause of

v. 19? For what does the second word *given* serve? To whom on earth were the Levites given? For what works? What twofold antitypical service have the Gospel-Age Levites performed? In what capacities? Which of these two was the more especial work of the Levites? What is the twofold work in the type called? To whom on earth first of all were the Levites given? To whom next? What does this imply? What does this type? What have the Gospel-Age Levites, accordingly, done? How have the Gershonites assisted our Lord? Why? How have the Kohathites assisted Him toward the people? Toward the Priests? How have the Merarites assisted Him toward the people and the Priests?

(76) Whom else than the High Priest have been helped by them? What was a part of the Church's Gospel-Age commission? How is this shown by the cited Scriptures? How long was this a part of her special work? What did the Elijah class, accordingly, do? What connection with that mission did the antitypical Libnite Gershonites have? How did they assist in the first part of the Church's mission? What was the second part of the Church's mission? How does St. Paul show this feature of her work? What branch of the Gershonites helped her therein? How?

(77) What group of the antitypical Levites were of most assistance to the Priests? In what two ways was this typed? What two kinds of Priests have they helped? Which of these more especially? Which class of antitypical Kohathites have rendered them the most effective service? In what kind of helps? What work have the antitypical Gershonite Amramites done? How have they therein helped the Priests? What is an example of such help? Who were some of the leading antitypical Gershonite Amramites in New Testament text work? Who is the greatest of these in Old Testament text work? How do the labors of these assist the Priests?

(78) Who are the other antitypical Amramites? In what forms have they helped the Priests? By what do they first help the Priests? How so? What is the advantage of having a number of Bible translations? What is the next form of helps offered by the antitypical Eliezerite Amramites? What are the names of the four chief English concordances? What are their excellencies? How do they

compare with one another? How have they been helpful to the Priests? What are the three chief concordances to the Greek and Hebrew texts? What characterizes each? Which one was especially helpful to our Pastor? What other two classes of helps have the antitypical Eliezerite Amramites furnished the Priests? Wherein do these assist them?

(79) What is the relative value of the antitypical Amramite helps, compared with those of the other antitypical Kohathite helps? What kind of antitypical Levites are the introductionists? In what two ways especially have the antitypical Zichrite Izeharites been helpful to the Priests? What kind of antitypical Levites are the exegetes? How have they helped the Priests? What kind of antitypical Levites are the harmoneticians? What are the four main kinds of helps that they have given the Priests? How have these assisted the Priests? What are the names of four especially helpful antitypical Korahite Izeharite works?

(80) What others' writings have ministered to the Priests? In what ways in Biblical history and biography have they done this? Who are some of the writers on these matters? In what ways in Church history and biography have they done this? What writers have been or will be helpful on these matters? What other class of books of antitypical Hebronites have been helpful? In what respects? Who are prominent as writers of such books? To what other kind of works do these thoughts apply? Who were some of the pertinent writers?

(81) How relatively have the Gospel-Age Uzzielites stood as helpers of the Priests? Of whom is this especially true? Generally speaking, on what subjects have they been of almost no help, rather of hindrance, to the Priests? What were the exceptions to this general rule? What two men illustrate this for the Presbyterian and Lutheran stewardship doctrines? What did such antitypical Elzaphanite Uzzielites do as to their stewardship doctrine toward the Priests in their respective denomination? In all other denominations? Who were the Gospel-Age Mishaelite Uzzielites? How does our estimate of them compare with that of the Gospel-Age Elzaphanite Uzzielites? What have they done ethically with the stewardship doctrines of their denominations? Give illustrations of this from Lutheran

and Presbyterian ethicians? How are ethicians and dogmaticians comparable from the standpoint of reliability? Why so?

(82) What were the Gospel-Age Zithrite Uzzielites? How has their help of the Priests compared with that of the other Uzzielites? Why? For what have they written? What, in the first place, has this purpose moved them to do? What was their second work? From what standpoints? What did they seek to meet by this? Who have been some of the main Gospel-Age Zithrite Uzzielites? What did they accomplish? What has been the nature of the attacks they met? What did their success therein prove?

(83) What kind of works have representatives of all Gospel-Age Kohathite groups produced? For what purpose do such works serve? What do such works lack? For what good are they? What are among the most helpful Bible dictionaries? Bible encyclopedias? Theological and ecclesiastical encyclopedias and dictionaries? What kind of works are these? What other similar works may be added? What are among the most helpful secular encyclopedias in English? Where are other similar works to be found? Why are these advantageous to Priests? What do they lack? Where must one look for these? What Bible dictionary do many Priests have?

(84) For whom have the Gospel-Age Kohathites' works been especially helpful? What case will well illustrate this? What kind of a scholar was our Pastor not? What did enemies of his seek to make of this fact? What does this fact serve to bring out? Why? How did he make up for the implied deficiencies? How have errors been entrenched in translations? The Truth? How could our Pastor ground the Truth on the correct and applicable translations? What Hebrew words, among others, were so treated? Greek words? How many cases to the point were noted in the six volumes by one who knew Greek and Hebrew? What impression was made by this fact? How did the Gospel-Age Gershonite Amramites help our Pastor? What Gospel: Age Gershonite Amramite's work serves as an illustration of this fact?

(85) How did he get help from commentators? Chronologians in Vols. 2 and 3? Church historians in the Antichrist

chapter and parts of Vol. 3? What are some illustrations of this? Who helped him on the Pyramid chapter of Vol. 3? On many facts in Vol. 4? What kind of helps did he get on Vol. 5? In what other publication of his is this fact manifest? What did he make on suitable occasions as to such help?

(86) Who else is likewise indebted to the Gospel-Age Kohathites? In preparing what articles did he get help from Gospel-Age Hebronites? From Gospel-Age Korahite Izeharites? From what kind of grammars did he get help in the Robisono-Universalism article? From whose concordances did he get help on various Greek and Hebrew words? What other antitypical Amramite works were therein used? How often does he need antitypical Kohathite writings? Where are these works found? On what principle was his library built up? What must not be inferred from the above acknowledgments? Why not? What is thereby to be understood? How do these helps save the time of mouthpiece Priests? How do they shed light on obscure customs and allusions? What are some illustrations of these ways of help? Why were the Gospel-Age Kohathites given to the Priests?

(87) What other class of Gospel-Age Levites have helped the Priests? How comparatively with the other Levites? How do they stand in relation to the other Levites and the Priests? What are they not, as to this relation? How is this shown in their editing and publishing vernacular Bibles? Bibles in the original languages? In editing and publishing Greek and Hebrew dictionaries, grammars and concordances, as well as vernacular ones? How does this principle apply as to Gospel-Age Izeharite, Hebronite and Uzzielite works? For what is their work indispensable for the Priests? Without their work what would be the effect of the Kohathite works? What, then, is the relation of their work to that of the Priests' use of the Kohathites' work? What writings have Gospel-Age Gershonites prepared? What have these accomplished for those in the Camp and the Gospel-Age Levites and Priests? How have the Gospel-Age Merarites served the Priests by editing and publishing these works? What has our study so far of v. 19 shown?

(88) With what did our last paragraph close? With

what does this one begin? With what thoughts of v. 19 does this one begin? What is the first effect on our minds of the thought that the Levites made atonement? What will dissolve this surprise? What are the two parts of the atonement process? With what part did the Levites have nothing to do? Who had a more important part in its second feature to do than the Levites? Wherein did the latters' part therein consist? How did they perform it? Just what did they effect in the people in performing it?

(89) Who are the Gospel-Age Camp? In what way did the Gospel-Age Levites not work atonement for the Camp? Whose work was this? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What role in the second part of the Gospel-Age atonement work did the Levites not play? Whose work was this? How does the cited Scripture prove this answer? In what capacity did the Gospel-Age Levites serve therein? In what did they succeed? In how much of it? What is the difference between the Gospel-Age Camp's Levites and Priests' pleasement with God? What different expectations does God cherish of these three classes as to this matter? What was the limit of the Gospel-Age Camp's pleasement with God? What would it include? At what would it stop short? How do repentance and faith stand related to the Gospel-Age Camp and Court? Who subordinately worked these things in them, as a part of the atonement work's second feature? Why was such a measure of atonement necessary for them?

(90) How did the Libnite Gershonites effect this in the Gospel-Age Camp? How did the Shimite Gershonites work in this matter? How did the Gershonite Amramites help along in this matter with the Camp in general, and with certain ones in it in particular? How did the Eliezerite Amramites effect these two Camp classes? The Zichrite Izeharites? The Nephegite Izeharites? The Korahite Izeharites? The Hebronites? Through what kind of works especially? The Elzaphanite Uzzielites? The Mishaelite Uzzielites? The Zithrite Uzzielites? The Mahlite Merarites? The Mushite Merarites?

(91) What was the purpose of the Levites' making an atonement for the Israelites? To what kind of a plague does the type refer? In harmony with what was this? What did that covenant promise the obedient? Threaten

the disobedient? What did the Levites' faithfulness in their work effect for the Israelites in this respect? Their unfaithfulness? What resulted therefrom? What are examples of the keeping away of plagues? Their sending?

(92) How did each sub-group of the Gospel-Age Gershonites, Kohathites and Merarites keep the Camp from being plagued? How did they fail to avert plagues therefrom? How does the example of England illustrate the former experience from 1740 to 1840? What priestly movement led in this? How did the various Levite groups assist therein? Through what works did the Gershonites do this? Through what special books did Kohathites do this?

(93) At the same time what country exhibits the opposite experience? Who was the leader of the unfaithful Levites there in this course? What form did the pertinent plague assume? What did it effect? During what periods do we find the most noted examples of the operation of symbolic plagues? What occasioned them? How was this done among the Gershonites? Among the Kohathites? To whom did they lazily abandon their work? Among the Merarites? What resulted from this?

(94) What is meant by the last clause of v. 19? What thought does it bring out? What does it suggest in the antitype? What did the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of the Gospel-Age Levites work for them in these respects? What do vs. 20-22 tell us as matters of fact? What will not be done with these verses here? Why not?

(95) What is set forth in the rest of the chapter? At what ages were the Levites to begin and end their laborious service? To what do the word translated *"service"* in vs. 24, 25 and 26, and the word translated *"serve"* in v. 25 refer? In what was it performed? What Levites were exempt from such labor? In what could they work? By what word is this form of work expressed? What at first sight seems contradictory between v. 24 and seven verses in Num. 4? How are these passages harmonized?

(96) What is typed by a Levite's not being permitted to serve at all before 25 years of age? How does this apply to the Gospel-Age Gershonites? Kohathites? Merarites? Why was this? What is typed by the Levites' undergoing the five-year apprenticeship, in the three classes of Gospel-Age

Levites? When are a man's powers usually at their best? How did God deal with this fact in the type under consideration? What does this type? What is typed by the laborious service continuing for the involved 20 years?

(97) What is typed by the Levites' ceasing from their laborious service at 50? What is typed by the Levites' performing the lighter work of the tabernacle after 50? Teaching the people? What is typed by the decreasing disabilities of the Levites with advanced age? In what ways could such become totally disabled? What is typed by a Levite past 50 becoming totally disabled? What is typed by the difference in the abilities of the Levites to serve between 30 and 50? How is this manifest in the preachers, evangelists and lay workers? In four kinds of scholarly writers and lecturers? In editors and publishers? What three things move God to make different uses of the Priests? Of the Levites?

(98) What is implied in the last sentence of v. 26? For whom was this intended in the type? How did it affect him? In what did the effect in Moses result? What does this type? What is typed by Moses' performing the type properly? In what did performing the antitype result?

In the presence of the Glory,
What no mortal sees he saw,
And from hand that no man touches
Brought the tables of the Law;
Law that bound them with observance,
Lest untutored wit might stray,
Each man where his private fancy
Led him in a wanton way;
Law that from the life redeemed them
Of loose Arabs wandering wild,
And to fruitful acres bound them
Where ancestral virtue toiled;
Law that dowered the chosen people
With a creed Divinely true,
Which subtle Greek and lordly Roman
Stooped to borrow from the Jew.

CHAPTER IX.

TWO PASSOVERS AND THE FIERY, CLOUDY PILLAR.

Num. 9.

THE GOSPEL-AGE PASSOVER. THE MILLENNIAL-AGE PASSOVER. THE CLOUDY PILLAR. THE FIERY PILLAR. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

OUR STUDY of the book of Numbers has brought us to the ninth chapter; and we pray that the Lord may bless it to all of our readers. Generally speaking, though not exclusively so, the antitypical difference pointed out by the original Passover in Egypt and its annual celebration is the following: the original celebration represents the actual sacrifice of Christ, our Lamb, and the Church's Gospel-Age feast upon Him as her justification throughout her consecrated course (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8); while the annual Passover represents the annual celebration of the Lord's Supper, which is related to our Lamb as the annual lamb was to the original lamb in Egypt (1 Cor. 11: 24-26). While this remark shows the general thought, the *first* annual celebration as narrated in Num. 9: 1-14 shows that certain features of the antitypical real feast, as distinct from the annual symbolic feast, are also indicated in this *first* annual celebration. Yea, even certain Millennial features are therein brought to our attention. As we come to these features we will point them out. Our purpose of calling this matter to the attention of our readers at this stage of matters is to forestall a possible misunderstanding arising from an exceptionless application of the general rule just given, *i.e.*, that while the original Passover in Egypt represents Christ, our Lamb, and the Church's feast on Him as her justification throughout her consecrated course, the annual Passover represents the annual Lord's Supper.

(2) In harmony with the general rule just stated,

we understand the Lord's charging Moses to command Israel to keep the first annual Passover (vs. 1-3) to type, primarily, God's charging our Lord to institute the annual Lord's Supper and directly to instruct the Church to keep it annually (Luke 22: 19; 1 Cor. 11: 24, 25), and, secondarily, and indirectly, through the Apostles (1 Cor. 11: 23-34) and other servants of the Truth throughout the Gospel-Age, to instruct the Church to keep it annually. The charge being given in the wilderness of Sinai (v. 1) types the fact that the charge is a Gospel-Age matter, belonging to the Church's wilderness experiences. Its being done in the first month of the second year (v. 1) suggests the thought that the charge to keep the first annual Lord's Supper very properly sets in after the thing (the reality) of which it is a symbolic representation and commemoration had, at least in its beginnings, been in fulfillment (John 6: 32-58). And, of course, the appropriateness of the annual Supper as a thing to be partaken of after consecration, is typed by the charge to keep the typical annual Passover after Israel left Egypt (v. 1). This is further indicated in v. 2 by the express statement that it was the *children of Israel* who were to keep the typical annual Passover. The clause of v. 2 translated, "Let the children of Israel *also*," should be rendered, "*And* let the children of Israel," since the Hebrew word, *ve*, has three meanings, *and*, *also* and *even*; for the charges of the preceding chapter were not given to Israel especially, but to Moses and Aaron; hence the connection does not suggest the word *also*. This corrected translation shows that the charge to keep the Passover was given immediately after the charges on the cleansing and consecration of the Levites were made, v. 1 being in narrative form to show the transition of thought from the one to the other transaction. The requirement that the typical Passover be kept at its appointed season, Nisan 14, types the charge that the Lord's Supper be kept on

Nisan 14, even as our Lord said, "As oft as ye do this [slay and feast on the typical lamb], do it [keep the Lord's Supper] in remembrance of Me." The fact that the symbolic representation and commemoration of the original typical Passover was kept annually on its anniversary implies that the antitype of the annual Passover, *i.e.*, the Lord's Supper as the symbolic representation and commemoration of Christ as our Passover, be kept on the anniversary of our Lamb's death, *i.e.*, on Nisan 14 (v. 3). In the antitype this is all the more appropriate, since the entire Gospel-Age is the antitype of the night of the original Passover in Egypt, while the annual Lord's Supper is the antitype of the annual Passover.

(3) The annual lamb was to be slain at the same time—6 P.M., "between the two evenings" (see the margin of v. 3), as the original lamb (Ex. 12: 6). This suggests the thought that the Lord's Supper would the first time be celebrated on the same day that our Lord would die—a thing emphasized in the Scripture by the records of Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul (1 Cor. 11: 23). The emphasis on the exact date (v. 3) as to the time of keeping the annual type, serves to emphasize the fact that the antitype be kept annually. The charge to keep the typical Passover according to all its rites (*chok*; literally, *statutes*,—A.R.V., which indicates its pertinent practices) and according to all its ceremonies (*mishpat*; literally, *judgments*, or *ordinances*,—A.R.V., which indicates its pertinent teachings), types the Lord's charge during the Gospel-Age to celebrate the Memorial Supper according to the practices that Jesus gave at its original institution and according to the doctrines that He there set forth, and as these were later by Him elaborated through His Apostles. The antitypical statutes (here mistranslated *rites*) required unleavened bread and wine instead of the typical Lamb (Matt. 26: 26-28; Mark 14: 22-24; Luke 22: 19, 20; 1 Cor. 11: 23-25), the celebration annually

on the same day of the month (and that as a supper in the evening) as that of the type (1 Cor. 11: 25), to be annually preceded by the casting out of antitypical leaven (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8; 11: 28), as the typical feast was preceded by the purging out of typical leaven (Ex. 13: 7), to be partaken of amid trialsome experiences (Matt. 26: 31; 1 Cor. 11: 31, 32), as the typical one was with bitter herbs (Ex. 12: 8), and to limit the partakers to the consecrated (shown by the eleven partakers of the original Lord's Supper, as representing the consecrated), even as only the circumcised might partake of the typical annual lamb (Ex. 12: 43-49). The antitypical judgments; or ordinances (doctrines), connected with the Lord's Supper are the ransom sacrifice, justification by faith (Matt. 26: 28; Mark 14: 24) and, what the typical lamb does not show, but what is typed in the bitter herbs, the joint sacrifice of the Church with Jesus. This is taught by Jesus in Luke 22: 20, where the Greek construction shows that the clause, "that which is being poured out for you," does not modify the word "blood," as the A. V. suggests, but is the predicate of the word "cup." The following translation and order of words, necessitated by the Greek Grammar to make the thought clear to an English-speaking person, will clarify this matter. This cup—that which is being poured out for you—is by My blood the New Covenant, *i.e.*, the sufferings (cup) that God arranges for the Church to undergo are by Jesus' merit [the seal of] the New Covenant. The Apostle Paul (1 Cor. 10: 16, 17) likewise connects this thought with the bread and wine as symbolizing the Church's share with Jesus in the Sin-offering. The antitype shows that our explanation of the Hebrew words *chok* (*statute*) and *mishpat* (*judgment*; *ordinance*) is correct, while the renderings of the A. V. (*rites* and *ceremonies*) are not distinguishable in clear-cut meanings, and hence are clearly incorrect.

(4) While in vs. 2, 3, the type of God's charge to

Jesus on instituting the Lord's Supper and on commanding His Own to keep it, is given, in verse 4 Jesus' fulfilling these charges is typed; for Moses' commanding Israel to keep the annual Passover (v. 4) types Jesus' commanding His Own to keep the Lord's Supper, which, of course, implies its original institution. This in its wording is a command to the Lord's people to keep it. The Israelites' keeping of the Passover (v. 5), *i.e.*, slaying the lamb and roasting and eating it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, types the Gospel-Age Israelites' consecration of the bread and wine and partaking of these with the unleavened bread of sincerity and Truth (1 Cor. 5: 8), with the bitter herbs of the trials, external and internal, sufferings and persecutions of their consecration (2 Tim. 3: 12). Their doing this on Nisan 14 (v. 5) types the Church's celebrating the Memorial on Nisan 14. The Israelites' doing this in the wilderness of Sinai types the Church's doing this in her wilderness experiences, especially, though not exclusively, during the Harvests. The Israelites' doing this according to all that Jehovah commanded Moses (v. 5), *i.e.*, according to all the statutes and ordinances, types Spiritual Israel, especially during the Harvests, doing this according to all the practices and doctrines that God commanded Jesus to inculcate in His Own. So much of the types of vs. 1-5 apply to the Lord's Supper; but it will be recalled that above we remarked that, while ordinarily the annual Passovers of the Jewish-Age type the Lord's Supper of the Gospel-Age, the first annual Passover (vs. 1-5) had associated with it certain features and teachings that apply to the antitypical real, as distinct from the antitypical symbolic feast, throughout the Gospel-Age; yea, that some of its features and charges refer even to the real feast of the Millennial Age. These things are set forth typically in vs. 6-14. To these we will now devote our attention, we trust, in a profitable study.

(5) Vs. 6-8 give an episode that is most interesting

in the antitype. Those defiled by the dead body of a man on Nisan 14 and thus debarred from keeping the Passover on that day type those who spend their whole life under the Adamic curse and die thereunder (Num. 19: 11-18; T 105-110). The dead man of this verse is Adam. From him, dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2: 1, 5), we all derive depravity (*defiled*) and condemnation by heredity, whereby we are symbolically in Adam's presence; and we touch him in the sense of acting sinfully in such depravity. In the type these defiled ones had been in the presence of, or touched a dead man within less than seven days from Nisan 14, consequently when it came less than seven days after they had incurred their defilement (Num. 19: 11, 12, 14, 16, 19), they were defiled, and in such a state could not participate in the Passover. This types the fact that whoever to the end of his life during the night of antitypical Nisan 14, the Gospel-Age, does not through a persevering tentative or vitalized justification cleanse himself of the Adamic condemnation and depravity cannot celebrate the real feast at all (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8), nor its annual Memorial, worthily. Thus by faith he cannot lay hold on Christ as his Lamb taking away his sin and condemnation (John 1: 29, 36), *i.e.*, cannot "offer an offering of the Lord in its appointed season" (v. 7). The defilement and its condemnation lasting seven days types the fact that one must undergo actual or reckoned cleansing of the Millennial Age, the antitypical seventh day, in order to be rid of the Adamic defilement and condemnation. The ceremonial purification on the third day types tentative justification (tentative justification starting with the Abrahamic covenant, which began to operate in humanity's third Millennium in sin or death) and that of the seventh day types reckoned or actual justification as operative in the reckoned or actual Millennium (Num. 19: 12). Hence these defiled men represent the non-elect world, who in this life do not keep the real antitypical Passover. Accordingly,

they die, lost under the Adamic condemnation. Their coming before Moses and Aaron (v. 6) types the world's coming to the attention of Jesus as God's Executive (Moses) and as God's High Priest (Aaron). Their doing this at a time that Moses did not know the answer to their question (v. 8) types the fact that the condemned and depraved race came not physically but to our Lord's attention, mind, for the matter on hand at a time when He did not know the answer; and yet it was after His baptism, since then He first became the [tentative] Executive and High Priest of God. When could this have been? We answer: between His baptism and the beginning of His ministry, *i.e.*, for the most part during the 40 days that He spent in the wilderness. An examination of the facts will prove this; for when Jesus returned from the wilderness, He knew that the condemned race would in the Millennium have the opportunity to celebrate the antitypical Passover. Not even being God's [tentative] Executive (antitypical Moses) and High Priest (antitypical Aaron) before His baptism, He must have gotten the answer between His baptism and emergence from the wilderness.

(6) Let us notice how this was: Jesus began to get the knowledge qualifying Him for His ministry just after His baptism, as for the first time "the heavens [the higher, spiritual things] opened unto Him, "became clear to Him (Matt. 3: 16). The first spiritual things that He saw was His begettal, according to the citation just made, since with the opening of spiritual things He saw the Spirit descending to and abiding in Him. Having a deep knowledge of the general details of the Plan when He came back from the wilderness, needed to explain that Plan to others, He must have gotten that knowledge from the time of His baptism to that return. Doubtless the general features of the Plan were opened up to Him in an orderly sequence, which implies that He first learned of God's will with

reference to Himself. The Spirit in Him meditating on the Scriptures, as shown by His experiences, etc., as to the Word, in Ps. 119, opened up before His mind the thought that the New Creature Christ must sacrifice His humanity, as the antitypical Lamb and Bullock, in order to the satisfying of Divine justice for the world's sin, if He were to become their Deliverer from the curse. After He had gotten a large and clear view of His own place in the Plan, doubtless the Lord's Spirit opened His eyes of understanding on the Church as His fellow-sufferers and co-reigners, as the second great feature of the Plan. Thus, as in the mirror of the Word He saw Himself reflected, He likewise in that Word saw the Church depicted as, with Him, the mystery hidden from Ages and generations, made manifest then to Him, the First of the saints in point of time and rank. Then the question came up before His mind as He mentally saw the rest of Adam's race, and as He inquired of the Word, What is there in the Plan for these? The Spirit opened up the Scriptures to Him as holding out the hope of Millennial restitution as the portion that Jehovah had arranged for them. And with this there were made clear to Him the three great features of the Plan, Christ, the Church and the world. With this explanation we are now ready to look at the particulars of vs. 6-11. Seeing the defiled and condemned race standing before His mind's eye He antityped Moses and Aaron seeing the defiled men standing before them.

(7) It is this transaction connected with the unclean men that gives us the thought that the first annual Passover did not type exclusively the Lord's Supper. Rather, the Lord used it to represent the real and symbolic antitypical Passover, as the sequel will show. As the uncleanness of the pertinent men (v. 6) prevented their partaking in the Passover on that Nisan 14, so those not consecrated cannot partake of the real antitypical Lamb during the antitypical Nisan 14, the Gospel-Age.

Their drawing near (v. 6) before Moses and Aaron represents the condemned world coming to the attention of our Lord as Jehovah's [tentative] Executive and High Priest in the wilderness just after His baptism, as He was studying the various features of God's Plan in order to learn God's will for Him toward the world. By this we are not to understand that the condemned world actually, physically, presented themselves before the Lord in the wilderness. Rather, the antitypical presentation was mental, as an activity of our Lord's mind, in which He mentally viewed them, which put them mentally before Him. Nor are we to understand that there was a verbal speech made by the world to our Lord. Rather, it was their condition of Adamic defilement and condemnation until death that spoke to our Lord, in the sense of manifesting to Him their defilement and condemnation unto death. ("*We are defiled by the dead body of a man*," v. 7.) This condition conveyed the thought to our Lord that these could not partake of the Gospel-Age salvation of election, *i.e.*, keep the feast antitypical of Nisan 14 in Egypt and at Sinai, after the question was raised in His mind by that condition, "Wherefore are we kept back, that we may not offer an offering of the Lord [by faith lay hold on Christ, sacrificed for us as our substitute, acceptable to Jehovah in our stead] in its appointed season [during the Gospel-Age] among the children of [Spiritual] Israel?" In other words, the defiled men by their question to Moses type the condition of the condemned and defiled race raising in our Lord's mind the question as to why the non-elect world could not have the opportunity of keeping the antitypical Passover, *i.e.*, have the opportunity of obtaining the salvation of the High Calling operative during the Gospel-Age.

(8) When this question first struck our Lord's mind He did not understand the answer, typed by Moses' not knowing the answer to the typical question (v. 8).

Moses' charging the men to stand (the word *still* is not in the original), *i.e.*, wait for an answer, types Jesus' mentally bidding the race to wait for an answer. Moses' looking to the Lord to hear the Lord's answer to the question for the men, types our Lord's looking to God to speak to Him through His Word as to God's will for the world as to whether they should have an antitypical Passover (v. 8). Jehovah's giving Moses an answer types God's giving our Lord an answer through the Old Testament (v. 9). This answer was given to our Lord during the 40 days' experiences in the wilderness. The typical answer (v. 10) that the unclean and distant wayfarer might keep the Passover types God's answer that the condemned, defiled and erroneous race will have an opportunity to keep antitypical Passover, *i.e.*, have an opportunity to gain salvation through Christ's death. God's charge to Moses to speak this to the children of Israel types God's charge in the wilderness to Jesus to preach salvation for the world to Fleshly and Spiritual Israel. It will be noted that while the question was as to the defiled alone, the Lord answered as to these and the wayfarers wandering afar from the whereabouts of Israelites. What is the difference between these two? We understand that those unclean by the dead body of a man type those Adamically defiled and condemned as such, while the wanderers type those astray in error as such. Generally, but not exclusively, speaking, the defiled are nominal Jews and Christians; and generally, but not exclusively, speaking, the wanderers are the heathen. Both of these classes are, of course, excluded from the opportunity of the elective salvation, but for both of them God has in reservation a Passover keeping, an opportunity of gaining salvation. The expression, "of you or of your posterity," suggests the thought that as the type applied to all Fleshly Israelites so the antitype applies to all antitypical Israelites.

(9) But there is a difference in time of the defiled

ones' keeping their Passover from that when Israel in general kept it. While the latter kept it the night of the 14th of the first month, the former were to keep it on the 14th of the second month (v. 11). We have already indicated that the night of Nisan 14 types the Gospel-Age, during which the antitypical clean Israelites have kept the real antitypical Passover, while the antitypically defiled could not then keep it. We know that the world will get its opportunity for salvation (have its Passover) during the Millennium. Hence the typically defiled ones' date for keeping Passover, the 14th of the second month, types the Millennium. And their keeping the Passover on the 14th of the second month types the world taking part in the restitution privileges by faith and obedience during the Millennium. Accordingly, the two Passover keepings of the second year of Israel's deliverance from Egypt represent respectively the Church and the world gaining their salvations during the Gospel and Millennial Ages respectively. Hence one of the thoughts of the type under consideration is that of the two salvations. Another is that of their different times of operation. And a third is that the deliverance of the Church and the world depends on their appropriating life from the antitypical Passover, Christ, through appropriating (the Church by faith, the world by faith and works) Christ's righteousness, or, to put it in another form, Christ's perfect humanity, in His right to life and His life-rights. For the defiled class to sacrifice the lamb between the two evenings (v. 11) types that each one as soon as the Millennium would begin for him (which will vary with the individuals, depending on when the Millennial privileges will in each case begin to operate) should avail himself of its benefits and accept the Lamb by faith and obedience from the outstart of his opportunity to lay hold of Him. With some—the Epiphany camp of the then living—this will take place as soon as the Millennial restitution opportunities set

in, and they become aware of the fact. Through the teachings that they, the unconsecrated Gentile and Jewish believers, will have received from the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, they will be intently watching for the return of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, which will be to them the signal that the restitution salvation is operating; and they will then immediately avail themselves of it, *i.e.*, begin to keep the Millennial Passover, thus beginning it between the evenings, at their transition from the one to the other dispensation. With others this will set in also as soon as they come in touch with Millennial conditions, which means for the bulk of mankind at their awakening from the dead.

(10) The defiled ones eating the Passover with unleavened bread (v. 11) types the restitutionists purging out the leaven of error and sin from themselves and partaking of and with the Truth and its Spirit in a manner similar to our keeping our Passover (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8). But how about their partaking of the antitypical bitter herbs (v. 11) ? We have seen that our bitter herbs are sufferings and persecutions for righteousness and trials and tests of character. In the next Age there will be no persecutions and sufferings for righteousness; for the conditions of those times will be easy for the practice of righteousness (Ps. 72: 7); and no more will anyone be allowed to persecute for righteousness (Is. 25: 8). Hence these two kinds of our bitter herbs the restitutionists will not receive. Nevertheless this type proves that they will have to partake of antitypical bitter herbs. What are these? Such sufferings and hardships as are incidental to their overcoming their weaknesses and to their striping for bad deeds to their reforming their character depravity; for then the judgments of the Lord will be abroad in the earth, striping wrong-doing and correcting evil habits (Is. 26: 9). It will be more or less hard for wrongdoers to make restitution to their present victims, and

it will be more or less difficult to climb up by exertion of one's full strength from the depths of depravity to the heights of perfection. But those who will so do, enduring the incidental stripes and difficulties, will thereby be eating the Millennial bitter herbs. Hence the Millennial bitter herbs will consist of the stripings for wrong and the trials incidental to reformation and to character testings. But these must be eaten, appropriated, together with the unleavened bread of the Truth and its Spirit, if they would eat their Lamb as their Passover.

(11) In describing the type of the Millennial Lamb, v. 12 says that none of it shall be left over until the morning, *i.e.*, that is, all of it must be eaten that night. But in describing the type of the Gospel-Age Lamb, the account (Ex. 12: 10), in addition to telling Israel that nothing of it was to remain until morning, adds that if it were, it should be burned. At first glance there seems to be a discrepancy between the two charges. But a careful consideration of the antitypes shows that it is only a seeming discrepancy as between the two texts. How may we reconcile the two verses? We answer, by limiting Ex. 12: 10 to the Gospel-Age and Num. 9: 12 to the Millennial Age. The charge in each verse to leave none of the lamb over until morning means that all the merit needed must be appropriated before the respective Age is ended, and the next one begins, *i.e.*, in the Gospel-Age each one must appropriate unto a completion to himself by faith as much of Christ's merit as is needed to bring up his deficiencies to perfection, and none of such needed merit should be left unused; for if any of such needed merit were left unused by an individual until the Millennium he would lose life, since there would be uncovered imperfection in him when his trial time would be over. This happens when begotten ones die impenitent; for in such a case when the Millennium (the morning for the Church) comes, he is in that Age with some of the

Lamb's flesh left over and consequently he must be lost. And for the Millennial Age the thought is the following: Each one must appropriate by faith and works for himself in their entirety Christ's perfect humanity, His right to life and His life-rights before that Age is over and the Little Season sets in. If he leaves any part of these unappropriated, he enters the. Little Season with an imperfect character and thus will fall in the final trial during the Little Season. Thus there is, apart from a difference due to the dissimilarities of a faith as distinct from a works justification, substantial likeness between the leaving of nothing of the Lamb over until the two antitypical mornings, that of the Millennium and that of the Little Season.

(12) There yet remains a difference, however, between the two verses, because Num. 9: 12 says nothing about burning any of the uneaten parts of the lamb, while Ex. 12: 10 does direct the burning of the uneaten parts of the lamb. The difference, of course, is not a contradiction, but is due to a different dispensational dealing at the ends of the two Ages. It will be noticed that during the Gospel-Age *not all* of Christ's merit is *imputed* to any individual, but only that amount of it that is necessary to bring the deficiencies in the flesh of each individual new creature up to perfection. Consequently, when the end of the Gospel-Age comes, some of Christ's merit on deposit with God will not have been imputed, though all of it has been on deposit with God as against Adam's sentence as it involved us, which made an imputation of the part needed to supplement our deficiencies sufficient to give us an imputed justification. This unimputed portion of Christ's merit is the part of our Lamb that is left over, referred to in Ex. 12: 10. And what is typed by its being burned with fire? It will be recalled that it is a part of the merit deposited with God to make possible an imputed justification, and as such was usable—ready for use for imputations throughout the Gospel-Age. But with the

end of the Age of imputed justification, such imputed justification ceases to operate—no more of such justifications will be made; and hence imputable merit ceases to exist, not in the sense of the merit itself going out of existence (for it will be then used, by way of application as distinct from imputation, to make operative a works-justification), but in the sense that the merit will never again be used for purposes of imputation. This, then, making it cease to be an imputable thing, is what is typed by burning what was left over until the. morning of Nisan 14, while all of the merit being applied to make the Millennial justification operative, all of it must be used up before the Little Season begins, regardless of whether each will use up unto completion his share in all of it, since all of it—100% of it—will be applied for each individual Millennially; and hence none will be left over for appropriation after the Millennium; and hence all of it must be eaten before the Little Season, as none will exist after that for appropriation. Whoever, therefore, during the Little Season sins must go into the Second Death, as there is no more any of Christ's merit available to protect him from sins' wages, which must then be received.

(13) The charge that not a bone of the lamb should be broken (v. 12) is likewise significant, and applies as an exhortation to both the Gospel and the Millennial Age. To break a bone of a lamb would be doing it violence. And who are those who do violence to Christ, our Lamb? Ransom deniers and the new-creaturely consecrated who, like the washed sow, turn to wallowing in the mire of sin. These ransom deniers trample under foot the Son of God (Heb. 10: 28), while those who return to wallowing in the mire of sin crucify the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame (Heb. 6: 6); and both classes go into the Second Death. Some during the Gospel-Age do these two things (Heb. 6: 4-7; 10: 26-29; Jude 4; 1 John 5: 16); and some during the Millennium and during its Little Season will do these two things—the infant of days

during the Millennium, and the old men who have not filled their years [with good] after the Millennium (Is. 65: 20). The typical exhortation not to break a bone of the lamb (v. 12) represents the warnings of both Ages against doing these two evil things. The exhortation to keep the Passover of the 14th of the second month *according to all its ordinances* (*chukath*—statute, practice; not *mishpat*—judgment, ordinance, doctrine) is similar to that given in verse 3 with reference to the statutes. The only difference is that the antitypical bitter herbs do not include persecutions and sufferings for righteousness. Hence, having explained these while commenting on v. 3, we need not repeat them here. It will be noted (see A.R.V.) that the word *chukath* (statute) is singular. This singular does not refer to one statute, but to all the pertinent ones, even as the word every (not *all* here) before it implies. Thus the word *law* frequently means all the laws. It will also be noted that the word for judgment, ordinance, doctrine, does not occur in this verse. It is to be understood as implied; for the restitution class will have to hold to the pertinent Truth while they will be keeping the Millennial Passover.

(14) We find that a threat of death is held out as the penalty for the clean and the non-wayfarer, if they refrain from keeping the Passover. This threat applies antitypically during the Gospel and Millennial Ages. The Gospel-Age clean are the consecrated—those on whose behalf the merit of Christ has been imputed. Hence the Church of the Firstborn and the Youthful Worthies are the clean of the Gospel-Age. The non-wayfarers of the Gospel-Age are these from the standpoint of their having the Truth, who, accordingly, are not wandering off into error. Thus the clean and the non-wayfarers of the Gospel-Age are all who are put on trial for life or for faith and righteousness during the Gospel-Age. What is meant by those of such not keeping the Passover? Their failing to maintain their faith in the precious blood of Christ and to carry out

their consecration, their failing to purge out the old leaven of sin and error, to eat the unleavened bread of sincerity and Truth and to endure the incidental trials, sufferings and persecutions. In a word, their proving unfaithful. The threat of death upon the types of these represents the threat of the Second Death or loss of Youthful Worthiship, as the case calls for, made to those who fail to keep the antitypical Passover of the Gospel-Age. The clean of the Millennial Age are the world of mankind freed from the Adamic sentence and either partly or wholly lifted up from its effects into perfection. The Millennial non-wayfarers are the world as respects their being enlightened as to the Truth. If such refuse to keep the Passover they will perish in the Second Death. Those of the Millennially enlightened who refuse so to do for a hundred years are then cut off. And those of the enlightened and cleansed who refuse to do this during the Little Season are likewise cut off. The reason for this is typically given as follows: "because he brought not the offering of the Lord in its appointed season," (v. 13), *i.e.*, did not present to God as his sufficient substitute our Lord as the antitypical Lamb, with true faith, hope, love and obedience. This left him without protection from the justice of God; and consequently he had to bear his own sin (v. 13), which means the Second Death for the unfaithful of both dispensations on trial for life, and for the unfaithful Youthful Worthies, a loss of their standing as such now.

(15) A number of times in The Present Truth, *e.g.*, when treating of Ex. 12: 43-50, in the article on Israel's Enslavement And Deliverance, and of Ruth 2-4, in the article on Ruth, Type And Antitype, we pointed out that the strangers in the land (v. 14) type the Youthful Worthies. Their dwelling in the land types their being consecrated, *i.e.*, in the Truth and its Spirit, while their not being born there types their not being Spirit-begotten. It is of the Youthful Worthies that v. 14 treats. For such an one to keep the antitypical Passover

unto the Lord, it is necessary that he do exactly what the new creatures do with it (v. 14). He must keep it according to the statute (*chukath*) of the Passover and according to the judgment, ordinance (*mishpat*) of the Passover. According to the doctrine (*mishpat*—judgment, ordinance) he must keep it, *i.e.*, in living faith in the Lamb as tentatively justifying him, through the tentative imputation of His merit. And according to the practice (*chukath*—statute) he must keep it, *i.e.*, during the Gospel-Age from 1881 onward as a part of Nisan 14, with the leaven of sin and error purged out, with the unleavened bread of sincerity and Truth and with the bitter herbs of trials, sufferings and persecutions, with the staff of God's Word in hand as his support, with the girdle of service about his loins and journeying out of symbolic Egypt to antitypical Canaan. When v. 14 tells us that there is one statute for the stranger and the Israelite born in the land, it gives us the thought that in the antitype there is no difference in what consecration requires of the new creatures and of the Youthful Worthies. They make the same vows of deadness to self and the world and aliveness to God. The difference is, therefore, not in the obligations that they take upon themselves, but in the use God makes of their consecration: the consecration of some is accepted by God through the begettal of the Spirit and that of the others is not. But the same antitypical Passover doctrines and practices both classes are to live out—one statute to the stranger and to the one born in the land. But as the Youthful Worthies now do these things, not as the parts of a trial for life, but of faith and loyalty, they will unto a completion do these things Millennially and in the Little Season as the parts of a trial for life.

(16) The second part of Num. 9 treats of the pillar of cloud and fire, which is mentioned quite frequently in the Bible, as the following references prove: Ex. 13: 21, 22; 14: 19, 20, 24; 33: 9, 10; 40: 34-38; Num. 9: 15-23; 10: 11, 12, 34; 12: 5, 10; 14: 14; 16: 42;

Deut. 1: 33; Neh. 9: 12; Ps. 99: 7; 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2. That it is typical is, among other things, proven by St. Paul's allusions to it in 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2, compared with vs. 6, 11. Its typical character is likewise proven by the fact that it was, as several of the above references show, a part of the Law arrangement. So, too, its relation to the tabernacle, which was typical, proves its typical character. Its being involved in certain other typical events, like Israel's march to the Red Sea, their experiences at the Red Sea, in Mount Sinai and thence in their journey from the Red Sea to Canaan, in the erection of the tabernacle and God's manifestations at Aaron's and Miriam's murmuring and at the murmuring of the Israelites over the death of Korah, Dathan, Abiram, etc., prove the same thing. Hence it was undoubtedly typical of better things to come. While the Bible nowhere expressly mentions the thing of which it is typical, the connections in which it occurs, the things that it did and the things in connection with which it was used, clearly prove that it types the Truth as due and its Spirit as the things that represent the Divine presence with God's people. Thus, as it led Israel all the way from Egypt to Canaan, it did for them what the Truth as due and its Spirits do to us—they lead us all the way from symbolic Egypt to heavenly Canaan (Neh. 9: 12; Ex. 40: 36-38; Num. 9: 15-23; 10: 11, 12, 34; Deut. 1: 33). Its symbolizing one of the parts of the real baptism (1 Cor. 10: 1, 2), as the sea symbolizes death as the other, proves that it symbolizes the Truth and its Spirit. Again, its being that from out of which God acted and spoke (Ex. 14: 24; 33: 9, 10; Num. 9: 17-20, 23; 10: 11-13; 12: 5; 14: 14; Deut. 1: 33; Ps. 99: 7) proves that it represents the Truth and its Spirit. Thus, while the Bible does not expressly state its precise antitypical meaning, its uses, its connections and its activities abundantly prove that it types the Truth as due and its Spirit.

(17) It is evident that by the Truth as due and its Spirit the Lord leads His people from the present evil

world (symbolic Egypt) to heavenly Canaan (the kingdom), as the Scriptures so amply prove. Thus it is by the Truth that they gain life (Ps. 119: 93; Matt. 4: 4; John 6: 63, 68). The Truth leads them on the way as the lamp to their feet and a light to their path (Ps. 119: 105; 2 Pet. 1: 18, 19; 1 John 1: 7; Is. 30: 21; Micah 2: 7). Apart from the Truth there is no true way to go, all contrary things leading to death (Is. 8: 20; Micah 3: 6). So, also, the Bible teaches that the Spirit of the Truth leads God's people. Thus it is the Spirit that gives life (John 6: 63; Rom. 8: 1-4, 11-14; 2 Cor. 3: 6; Gal. 6: 8). It is also the Spirit that guides God's people (John 14: 17; 15: 26; 16: 13; 1 John 4: 6). And certainly, apart from the Spirit, there is no true way, all things contrary leading to death (Matt. 26: 41; Rom. 8: 13, 14; Gal. 5: 16-21). We also know that while we in our humanity are immersed into death in the real baptism, we are in the New Creature immersed into the Truth and its Spirit (Matt. 3: 15-17; 28: 19 (*into the name* [mind and heart—disposition]; not *in the name*); Rom. 6: 3-11; 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2; 12: 13; Gal. 3: 27; Col. 2: 12). *We* also know that it is from out of the Truth and its Spirit that God speaks to us (Heb. 1: 1; 4: 12; 13: 7; Rom. 10: 8, 14-17; Ps. 68: 11; John 14: 24; 17: 8; Titus 1: 3; 1 Pet. 1: 11, 12, 25; 2 Pet. 3: 2; Rev. 3: 8; John 14: 17; 15: 26; 16: 11; Neh. 9: 20; Is. 61: 1; Acts 2: 4; 1 Cor. 2: 10; 1 John 5: 6; Rev. 2: 7, 11, 29; 3: 6, 13, 22; 14: 13; 22: 17). Thus we see that the literal Scriptures furnish us the antitypes of the uses put to the fiery, cloudy pillar. Our experiences corroborate these thoughts. Hence we are warranted in concluding that the cloudy, fiery pillar types the Truth as due and its Spirit, in their capacity of leading God's people of the Gospel-Age from antitypical Egypt to antitypical Canaan.

(18) V. 15 first states that on the day the tabernacle was erected the cloudy pillar covered it. This is also stated in Ex. 40: 33, 34. The tabernacle represents Jesus and the Church, as God's place of residence,

God's place of meeting with, and God's place of blessing the people (Rev. 21: 3-5). Usually the tabernacle in the wilderness types the Christ during their Gospel-Age experiences of humiliation, and the temple of Solomon their Millennial-Age experiences of glorification. Yet we find in the Bible the word *tabernacle* also applied to their Millennial-Age activities (Rev. 21: 3-5), and the word *temple* to their Gospel-Age conditions (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17; 6: 19; Eph. 2: 20-22; 1 Pet. 2: 5; Rev. 11: 19; 15: 6, 8; 16: 1). The antitype of the tabernacle in v. 15 is the Christ during the Gospel-Age. Hence the day that the tabernacle was reared up represents the Gospel-Age. The rearing up of the tabernacle is the Gospel-Age developing of the Christ class as God's place of residing, of meeting with, and of blessing the people. This antitypical tabernacle did not exist before our Lord's consecration, when the antitypical court, brazen altar and brazen laver sprang into existence, also the first vail and the High Priest stooping under it. His begettal was accompanied with the antitypical Holy and its lampstand, table of shewbread and golden altar coming into existence. At His death the antitypical second vail came into existence and at His resurrection the antitypical chest of the Ark and its mercy seat, cherubim and shekinah were joined, making the antitypical Most Holy come into existence insofar as Christ is concerned. At Pentecost the antitypical court, brazen altar and laver and first vail came into existence insofar as they represent the Church, as the justified humanity of the Church was consecrated; and at the same time the antitypical Holy and its lampstand, table and altar came into existence insofar as they represent the Church, as by Spirit begettal the first of the Church's new creatures came into being. Since then, as the remaining parts of the Christ have been coming into the tabernacle condition, the antitypical tabernacle has been in process of erection. The erection was completed, so far as the antitypical court's and Holy's including the Church is concerned, in 1914,

since which time, therefore, no more have been added to these. All through the Gospel-Age the antitypical second vail has been in process of erection insofar as the individual faithful ones are concerned as they completed their sacrifice unto death, and will be completed when the last member dies. Since Nisan 16, 1878, the antitypical Most Holy and chest of the Ark have been springing into existence insofar as they represent the Church; and these will be completed when the last member of the Christ class shall have passed beyond the vail. It is this whole creative process that is typed by the erection of the tabernacle (v. 15); and the time for this work is the Gospel-Age. Hence the day of this verse types the entire Gospel-Age (Joel 2: 29; John 17: 21-24; 16: 23, 26; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Eph. 2: 10).

(19) The cloudy, fiery pillar covering the tabernacle types the Truth as due and its Spirit resting upon the Christ class. This means that the Lord has throughout the Gospel-Age made the Christ class the recipient and depository of the Truth as due and of its Spirit. Certainly the Scriptures abundantly prove this thought, as the following passages, a few selected from among many, show: Ps. 25: 14; 97: 11; 119: 66, 99, 100, 130; Prov. 3: 32; Is. 30: 18-21; Amos 3: 7; Matt. 11: 25; 13: 11, 16, 17; Rom. 16: 25, compared with Col. 1: 26, 27; 2 Cor. 3: 13, 14. This has been their peculiar prerogative; for in the sense that they have these none others do. This is typed by the cloud resting upon the tabernacle and not, *e.g.*, on the camp or on the territory without the camp. To the great, mighty and wise of this world this claim sounds absurd; nevertheless it is true that whatever of Truth is due or whatever of the Spirit of the begettal is poured out, they are in the Church, and can be gotten only through the Church's ministry, implied in her being the depository of these (1 Kings 17: 1). All this, and more, too, is represented by the cloudy, fiery pillar resting upon the tabernacle. If the world rails at, and despises such a claim, it may do so; but this will not in the least alter the fact that

the Christ is the recipient and depository of God's Truth and Spirit as due. This, our privilege, beloved, by far surpasses what the world's greatest, mightiest and wisest may have or boast. Grateful to the Lord for this, the greatest of all privileges, we envy not the most favored of the present evil world whatever advantage they have or think they have.

(20) It will be noted that the pillar was a cloud by day and the appearance of light by night (v. 15). This is likewise typical. During the Gospel-Age there are two symbolic days and two symbolic nights. Thus the Parousia is frequently called a day and the Epiphany a night (Ps. 91: 5, 6; Matt. 20: 1-8). They are both called a day, symbolized by the light and dark part of a 24-houred day respectively (1 Cor. 3: 13; Eph. 6: 13). The watchman calls the trouble time—the Epiphany—a night, implying that a preceding period was a day—the Parousia (Is. 21: 11, 12). The night wherein no man can work (do reaping work, as the connection shows) is the Epiphany; hence it is preceded by a period called a day—the Parousia (John 9: 4). This passage has another application; for the day in which Jesus worked was the reaping time of the Jewish Harvest, implied also in the parallel Harvests, and a night followed that day, in which no reaping was done, and that night lasted from Oct., 69 A. D., until Oct., 1874. These two periods give us the other day and night of the Gospel-Age: the Jewish Harvest, the period between it and the Gospel Harvest. There is a reason why the two Harvests are each called a day and why their succeeding periods until the next succeeding days are each called a night. Based upon the fact that in nature the sun shines by day and the moon by night (Gen. 1: 16), the Bible, among other things, uses the sun to represent the New Testament and the moon to represent the Old Testament (Is. 60: 19; 30: 26; Matt. 24: 29; Acts 2: 20; Rev. 6: 12; 8: 12; 12: 1). Hence the periods during which the New Testament would mainly be giving light as a symbolic sun would be

days; and the periods during which the Old Testament as a symbolic moon would mainly be shining with its light would be symbolic nights.

(21) Self-evidently the New Testament truths shone during the Jewish Harvest, even as the preaching of that time and the production of the New Testament at that time prove. Hence the Jewish Harvest was a day as distinct from a night. There was, of course, some Old Testament light shining at that time also, though it was much less than the amount of New Testament light then shining. This fact is also illustrated by a partial moon shining visibly to us during part of the day, especially after the moon has passed her third quarter. An examination of our Pastor's writings—Parousia teachings—reveals the same fact; for his writings consist mainly of expositions of New Testament teachings, though to a considerably less degree they also contain, usually, short expositions of Old Testament Scriptures. A comparison of the amounts of the Comments devoted to the Old Testament and the New Testament Scriptures as set forth in the Berean Manual will quickly prove this thought to be true, if one remembers that the New Testament is about a fourth as large as the Old Testament. John's writings compose those New Testament Scriptures which were produced after the Jewish Harvest; and in the light of the figure under study are well illustrated by the light that the sun still gives for a while after it has sunk beneath the horizon. Thereafter set in the symbolic night, lasting until the Gospel Harvest. And the historical facts bear out this figure; for the stars of the five intervening churches shone Old Testament light more than New Testament light. *E.g.*, Arius, who was the principal man of the Pergamos star, Claudius of Turin, who was the principal man of the Thyatira star, Marsiglio, who was the principal man of the Sardis star, and John Wessel, who was the principal man of the Philadelphia star, wrote, one and all, mainly on Old Testament themes. The reason for this is quite evident:

Apart from what the papacy drew from heathen sources, which is no inconsiderable part of its counterfeit, it drew also in large measure from counterfeit Old Testament teachings its counterfeit for the Christ in His teachings, practices and organization. This of necessity forced not only the principal, but also the subordinate men of these stars to give true expositions, as far as due, of the pertinent Old Testament passages and facts counterfeitedly given by the papacy in palming off the before said counterfeit of the Christ.

(22) But the futl symbolic moon was not shining during the interval between the Harvests. Many of the passages and facts on which these brethren commented were seen by them only in part, as the writings of Claudius of Turin, Peter Abelard, Marsiglio, Wiclif, Wessel, Luther, Cranmer, etc., abundantly prove. However, they understood them well enough to expose and refute the papal counterfeits tortured out of Old Testament Scripfutes. And in this they accomplished the Divine intention in the premises. With the Reformation time (the Sardis and the Philadelphia periods) there was a long early and later dawn as this night was ending, like our early Northern summer dawn, preceding the Parousia Day. And from the standpoint of the figure under study this will account for the much larger relative use of New Testament Scriptures during the Sardis and Philadelphia periods than during the three preceding periods, especially the second and third of these. And this use continually increased as the Sardis and Philadelphia periods advanced, until when we come to Bros. Wesley, Stone and Miller, the New Testament increasingly came to the foreground in their preaching and writings. In the Epiphany, the night following the Parousia day, we have a full symbolic moon shining. This will account for the ever clearer expositions of Old Testament facts and passages and pertinent refutations of error during this Epiphany period. This will continue until all of the Old Testament not expounded by our Pastor will be

made clear by the end of the Epiphany (Rom. 15: 4; Is. 30: 25, 26). Not only so, but as we toward the end of the Epiphany night enter the dawn of the Millennial day, as distinct from the Parousia day and the Epiphany night (note the difference between this and the *Millennial Dawn* which is the end of the reign of sin viewed as a night Ps. 30: 5), as suggested by the figure under study; New Testament matters will again gradually advance to the foreground. The long promised true exposition of Revelation will then be given, which incidentally will refute the false ones offered to the Lord's people from time to time, especially by Levite leaders. This figure shows that the promised exposition will not come so soon as we had previously thought, *i.e.*, immediately after the great earthquake. It will likely begin to be written during the anarchy. This will afford ample time for us, by our articles on Numbers, etc., to give a goodly store of Church history as Biblically typed, to prepare well the Church in pertinent knowledge to appreciate the exposition of Revelation.

(23) Accordingly, we are now in one of the Gospel-Age's nights. And naturally therein we are to expect the moon—the Old Testament—to do the main shining. To expect the sun—the New Testament—now to do the main shining is unreasonable, since the day time is the proper period for the sun to shine and the night time for the moon to shine. Our Levite friends often criticize the Epiphany brethren for their large use of the Old Testament, particularly of its types, exclaiming, "Give us New Testament thoughts; we want New Testament truths and not Old Testament types!" To them we make the reasonable reply: The New Testament thoughts came as due in the Parousia day, as the rays of the symbolic sun. We are now in the night and the light now due is the moon light. And since our Pastor gave a very large amount of the Old Testament prophetic Truth, the light now due is more especially the symbolic moon's typical truths. If, as they do, they

continue to cry out for the symbolic sun's light and to deprecate the symbolic moon's light, we must tell them that their efforts to draw back the set symbolic sun for its light are as vain as would be the efforts of a man to lasso the set literal sun and draw it back to make day when night is due. Evidently this can be done with neither the literal nor the symbolic sun! And those who despise the shining of the full moon in this Epiphany night, and who insist on the symbolic sun to shine now, are seemingly not among those whom the symbolic sun did not smite by day, nor the symbolic moon by night (Ps. 121: 6). Their course seems to indicate that they were smitten by either one or both of them. And this is indicated by their barking at the symbolic full moon as its rays lighten the night. As a matter of fact, as a rule they do this as symbolic wolves (clericalists) and dogs (sectarians), even as literal wolves and dogs bark at the bright light of the literal moon. And we rather opine that the Levite leaders will be found to have been braying at that symbolic moonlight, even as asses are well known to bray at the light of the literal full moon. For our part, as illustrated in the figure under study, while recognizing that the sunlight of the Parousia day was much better, clearer and more desirable than the full moon light of this Epiphany night, nevertheless, since we are in that night time, and know that it is now due for the advancing light to come mainly from the symbolic moon and not mainly from the symbolic sun, we are grateful for having cloudless full moon light to brighten our pathway, and thus enable us to avoid the pitfalls of darkness and to walk in the shining path of the righteous. Let us, therefore, beloved, rejoice and be grateful for the kind of light that the Lord is pleased to give us now in the Epiphany night and not, like willful children, cry for the day light in the night time and despise the clear full moon light of the night in which we are and must remain until the next day.

(24) But some may say: You purposed to explain

the difference between the cloudy pillar and the fiery pillar, but have instead been explaining the symbolic sun as shining by day and the symbolic moon as shining by night. Is this not irrelevant to the subject under discussion? We reply that we do so because the symbolic sun and the symbolic moon mean in a general way the same as the antitypical cloudy pillar and fiery pillar; for the literal cloudy, fiery pillar served Fleshly Israel, so far as their marches and encampments were concerned, as the natural sun and moon do to mankind, clarifying their way and their places of abode; and hence the antitypical cloudy pillar and fiery pillar do for Spiritual Israel, so far as their symbolic marches and encampments are concerned, just as the symbolic sun and moon do for them, which fact serves rather closely to identify them, the different symbols bringing out different operations of the same things—the Word and Spirit enlighten (sun and moon) and lead (cloudy, fiery pillar). Hence the propriety of our discussing the symbolic sun and moon as such to elucidate the antitype of the cloudy, fiery pillar. It is from the standpoint that these type the Truth and its Spirit in the Old Testament and the New Testament kinds that we can understand the propriety of our Pastor's remark that the cloudy, fiery pillar was a manifestation of God's presence with Israel (Z '07, 216, 217), even as the Truth as due and its Spirit are the most manifest evidence of God's presence with His faithful Spiritual Israel. Accordingly, we have shown that the Gospel-Age day times, typed by the day time when the cloudy pillar was with Israel, are the reaping times of the Jewish and Gospel Harvests, and that the cloudy pillar, appearing as it did during the day, represents the New Testament Truth as due and its Spirit in the reaping times. And we have also shown that the night times when the fiery pillar appeared to Israel represent the periods immediately following these periods, between them and the day following, *i.e.*, they represent the period between the two reapings and the period between

the Parousia and the Millennium, viz., the Epiphany, while the fiery pillar itself represents the Old Testament Truth as due and its Spirit. This leads us to remark that there are still another day and night in God's plan. That day is the Millennium (Zech. 14: 4-9; Is. 25: 9), when the cloudy pillar (New Testament teachings adapted to New Covenant arrangements, and its Spirit) will lead the Millennial Israel, as typed by Israel's march from Etham to the Red Sea (Ex. 13: 20-22), up the Highway of Holiness to its final trial at the beginning of the Little Season. The third night will be the Little Season itself, typed by the night (Ex. 14: 20, 24, 27) at the Red Sea; and the fiery pillar will be the Old Testament truths adapted to the Little Season's needs of the faithful, and its Spirit. After the Little Season's night day will always be; for "there shall be no night there" (Rev. 22: 5).

(25) "So it was alway: the cloud covered it by day, and the appearance of fire by night" (v. 16). In this verse we have not only, by way of emphasis, a repetition of the statement of v. 15, but the added item that such was continually the case with the cloudy, fiery pillar. God's faithfulness as the Leader and Guide of His Fleshly Israel is thereby set forth; and antitypically His faithfulness as the Leader and Guide of His Spiritual Israel is taught. And, beloved, this certainly has in the past proven true; and it will ever prove true, until they shall safely arrive in antitypical Canaan. Therefore the Truth as due and its Spirit were present, as needed, to lead and guide Spiritual Israel in the Jewish Harvest, in the interval following that until the Gospel Harvest, in the Parousia, and now in the Epiphany. Always as needed the dear Lord gave the Truth due and its Spirit to His Faithful. While He became darkness more or less to the unfaithful and measurably faithful, He never once failed His own with a sufficiency of His Truth as due and its Spirit to lead and guide them to His Holy Hill, the Kingdom. Nor will He ever fail them in this respect; for "so it was

alway: the cloud covered it by day and the appearance of fire by night." And, beloved, so long as we abide faithful we may ever look for the antitypical fiery cloudy pillar among God's real people, and we will always find it resting upon them; for God designed it thus to be—His faithful Church is the recipient and depository of the Truth as due and of its Spirit, a fact guaranteed by the never failing faithfulness of Jehovah, our God and Father! Praise our God, all ye His saints, and be thankful at the remembrance of His holiness! His faithfulness is firmer than the mountains and more steadfast than the hills. It never wearies, falters or lags: "So it was alway!"

(26) But the cloudy, fiery pillar was not equally distinct to all Israelites, and that for two reasons: Increased distance gradually dimmed its clearness; so did decreased eye-sight. The priests who dwelt nearest to, or served in the tabernacle saw it most clearly; then the Levites who dwelt next nearest to, or served in the court saw it with the next degree of clearness; then those who dwelt in the camp saw it the least clearly. So, dear brethren, the antitypical Priesthood as new creatures see the antitypical cloudy, fiery pillar more clearly than the antitypical Levites as the Gospel-Age faith-justified; and these latter in turn see it more clearly than those in the antitypical camp—those who seek a measure of fellowship with God, but who do not even proceed to tentative justification, or who, having once had it, backslide from the court to the camp. A reason for these differences is the differing symbolic distances from their symbolic place of standing as to the antitypical pillar. Then, too, there are differences in the visibility of the symbolic cloudy, fiery pillar to those of the same classes. Thus some Priests see the antitypical pillar much more distinctly than do others. This is due to their having keener eyesight spiritually, backed by more of the Spirit, especially of study, than do other Priests. For a similar reason some justified ones have a keener insight into the justification features

of the antitypical pillar than do other justified ones. For a similar reason some of those in the antitypical camp see the moral and elementary justification truths more clearly than do other camp-dwellers, some of whom are nearly entirely symbolically blind. Thus those who walk and dwell close by the antitypical cloudy, fiery pillar are blessed with more of its light and Spirit than do those who walk and dwell not so close by. This suggests to us the desirability of our walking and dwelling as closely by the advancing Truth and its Spirit as we can. And if we so do, its light and direction will ever more clearly and blessedly lead us until we shall at last arrive at our Canaan inheritance and home and be forever blest and at rest.

(27) V. 17 gives in a summary what is divided into details in vs. 18-23. It shows that on the going up of the cloud from the tabernacle the children of Israel journeyed and that where it rested there they encamped. This is just as symbolic as the things of the pillar already studied. What is represented by the cloudy, fiery pillar beginning to move, proceeding to move and coming to a stop? Both the involved figures and our experience furnish us with the answer. Since the pillar represents the Truth as due and its Spirit, its beginning to move would fittingly represent these beginning to unfold. Accordingly, as from such a start the pillar would advance, so such advance fittingly represents the further unfolding of the advancing light and its Spirit. And its coming to a halt would fittingly represent the completion of the pertinent Truth and its Spirit. Thus each advance of the pillar toward Canaan would represent the advance of the Truth and its Spirit along a certain line or set of lines. This process, of course, would have a beginning, typed by the pillar's beginning to move, and an ending, typed by the pillar's halting. And in this set of acts a very important Biblical principle is brought to our attention. This is variously expressed by language like, "meat in due season" (Luke 12: 42), "light that shineth more

and more" (Prov. 4: 18) and "the testimony for due times" (1 Tim. 2: 6). The progressiveness of the Truth is indicated by these expressions; for the Biblical Truth has this peculiarity, that it progresses in a seasonable unfolding. And it so progresses in order to adapt itself to the varying needs, experiences and circumstances of God's people. In this as well as in other ways the Bible is quite different from human creeds, which, like hobby horses, jump up and down, but make no progress. Hence one may safely commit his thinking to the Bible as a guide, but not to creeds.

(28) One has said, The Bible is like the ocean—shallow enough in places for a babe to wade in, and deep enough in places for an elephant to swim in. The adaptability of the Bible to all conditions of spiritual development and to every need, experience and circumstance of God's children is one of the surest proofs of its Divine origin; for nobody but God could have made a Bible so elastically practical, and yet so true. Practical omniscience was needed to furnish such a leader and guide for God's people. Hence the Bible is a Divine revelation and is Divinely inspired. This is not a fanciful claim. It is attested by the experiences of all God's faithful people, as well as by God Himself in His revelation. The reason that the Bible Truth has this quality of progressiveness adaptable to the varying needs, experiences and circumstances of God's people is that God, foreseeing the needs, experiences and circumstances of His people, put something into the Bible to fit everyone of them; and whenever they arise He commissions Jesus, the Interpreter of the Bible and the Executive (Rev. 5: 2, 5, 7, 12) of its plan, to bring out these things from the Bible into the sight of His people. And, additionally, God so arranged the Bible that in its types and prophecies it gives a prophetic history of His people, in so far as their acts are connected with, and are a part of the unfolding of His plan. This He tells us in Amos 3: 7: "Surely the Lord Jehovah will do nothing but [except] He revealed [it as]

His secret unto His servants, the prophets." This means that nothing would occur in connection with the unfolding of God's plan (His secret) except it was beforehand revealed by Him through the writers of the Bible. And, conversely, nothing was written by its scribes but belonged to that plan and its unfolding.

(29) Hence every part of the Bible is revelatory. God's Gospel-Age people are the main agents advancing that plan. Hence it has so much to say of their doings in its teachings, types and prophecies. Hence, too, all their doings, needs, experiences and circumstances pertinent to the unfolding of His plan have been anticipated by God and are mentioned in the Bible. God put into the Bible these pertinent things, which speak out to them the appropriate things in their deeds, needs, experiences and circumstances; and in so doing it proves itself to be the giver of meat in due season, of light that shineth more and more, and of the testimony for due times. It is this progressiveness of God's Word that acts in the antitype of the cloudy, fiery pillar's beginning to progress and advancing in the progress to a completion. And when it has given all it has on a certain subject, it gives no more new things thereon, typed by the pillar coming to a halt. This progressive unfolding is a more or less slow process as viewed by man. It is very well described in Is. 28: 9, 10: "Whom shall He teach knowledge [the deep things] ? And whom shall He make to understand doctrine [again the deep things] ? Them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts. [Those who are advanced beyond the first principles of Christ (Heb. 5: 12—6: 2). Then to show that such He undertakes to teach only piecemeal and gradually, He says] For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little." The connection shows that this method will by Divine design stumble the unworthy and unfaithful (vs. 11-13), but will try unto approval the faithful. (V. 16—"He that believeth [the faithful]

shall not make haste," *i.e.*, as to the seeming slowness of the Word's unfolding, by attempting to take things into his own hands in impatience, as the unfaithful do, thereby running ahead of the Lord; for this can result only in mischief to them, if they do so, even as it always does to the unfaithful and unworthy). Let us, beloved, learn, in view of this characteristic of God's Word, to wait quietly upon the Lord's due time for everything "for in quietness and confidence will be our strength." So doing, all will be well with us.

(30) Not only are the actions of the pillar as stated in v. 17 typical; but the actions of the Israelites as stated in the same verse are also typical. These actions are twofold, marching and encamping. What these two things represent will become clear when we remember that in the Scriptures Fleshly Israel's journey from Egypt to Canaan types Spiritual Israel's journey from this present evil world to the Kingdom (Heb. 3: 1-4: 11; 1 Cor. 10: 1-14). Therefore we find frequent reference to the Christian life as a walk, a journey, and to Christians as strangers and pilgrims having here no continuing city as their residence, but traveling to another and better (1 Pet. 2: 11; Heb. 13: 13, 14; Ps. 107: 4-7; Is. 30: 21; Jer. 6: 16; Micah 6: 8; Rom. 6: 4; 8: 1; 2 Cor. 5: 7; 1 John 2: 6). As Fleshly Israel progressed toward Canaan by every advance made from one station to another, thus ever nearing Canaan, so they by their marches from station to station type the various features of progress that we make in the Christian life, taking us farther and farther from the present evil world and leading us ever nearer to fitness for, and to the Kingdom. Hence Israel's progress toward Canaan by their successive marches represents our progress in the Christian life, ever bringing us nearer to Kingdom fitness and, as a result, to the Kingdom itself. We make this progress especially by three kinds of steps in the Christian life: (1) study of God's Word; (2) ministry of, and according to God's Word; and (3) practice of God's Word, including in this third

item Christian watching and prayer. Thus our growth in knowledge, service and grace (2 Pet. 3: 18; Rom. 12: 1) is the thing represented by Israel's marches toward Canaan. That this is true is evident from the nature of the case; for as we continue to grow in these three respects, we continue to advance away from the world toward Kingdom fitness and consequently toward the Kingdom itself. And when we have completed this development we stand on Jordan's strand, at the end of our journey to the Kingdom. It is of this figure of the Christian's life progressing as a journey from symbolic Egypt to Heavenly Canaan, the Kingdom, that we so aptly sing in Hymn No. 71.

(31) So far as the active part of the Christian life is concerned, we have nothing else to do than the three things mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Let one think ever so long on the subject, he will be unable to mention a thing belonging to the developing, the active part of the Christian life, other than these three things. The various marches of the Israelites typed different features in these three steps in our Christian journey. For us the order in general was, first, to learn the special Truth typed by the pillar's advance; second, to help our fellows learn, spread and practice it and, third, to develop the graces and heavenly affections involved in this pertinent Truth. Our learning the pertinent Truth is typed by the Israelites' keeping their eyes on the advancing pillar. Our ministering this Truth to others is typed by the stronger Israelites' helping their weaker brethren to see the way before them, helping them carry their too heavy burdens and encouraging them to march on. Our progress in grace is typed by the Israelites' walking onward, step by step, from the beginning to the end of each march. Beloved, let us keep our eyes of understanding wide open, ever looking at our cloudy, fiery pillar. This is the first prerequisite for a successful march. Those Israelites who paid no attention to the cloudy, fiery pillar soon turned out of the way and presently found themselves separated from the others,

wandering in a waste, howling wilderness, with nothing to guide their steps. Few indeed of these ever regained the host, most of them perishing in the desert drear. So will it be with us unless we keep our eyes on our cloudy, fiery pillar. Nor let us neglect to minister to our fellow pilgrims in their needs; and above all let us look well at our steps that they continue following that cloudy, fiery pillar and not, as many do, let weariness, foot-soreness and the heat of the desert sun and sand cause us to give up the journey and turn aside from God's hosts. The commencement of our progress was typed by Israel's beginning to march, the continuance of this progress by their continued advance and the end of it by their ceasing from each march they took.

(32) But there is another part to the Christian life additional to its three active, its three developing, features. There is a passive part to the Christian life, which must endure trials and tests of character, sufferings for zeal in Truth and righteousness and persecution for loyal adherence to these. The Scriptures abundantly testify that these, too, are a part of the Christian life (Matt. 5: 10-12; John 16: 2; Acts 14: 22; 2 Tim. 3: 12; 2 Cor. 4: 8-13; Jas. 1: 2-4, 12; 1 Pet. 2: 19-21; 4: 12-16). It will be noted that none of these are the active, but all of these are the passive parts of the Christian life. They are expressive of endurance, not of development, hence are passive. We have seen that the active, developing, part of the Christian life is typed by the Israelites' following the cloudy, fiery pillar, but how does the passive part of the Christian life find typification in Israel's experiences between Egypt and Canaan? There was only one other feature of their wilderness experiences—their encampments. And these, their resting in their camps, represent the passive part of the Christian life. This is evident from the fact that since their journey consisted of but these two things, their marches and encampings, and that since their marches type the active parts of the Christian life, the only thing to type the passive parts of the

Christian life would be their encampments. And just as the character of a march fittingly typed progress in the Christian life, so the character of an encamping fittingly types standing under trial, suffering and persecution (Eph. 6: 13). Furthermore, all of Israel's typical trials occurred while they were encamped, which suggests the thought that our trial time is our camping time. Thus they were tried for the first time while encamped at the Red Sea (Ex. 14: 2-20). Their trials over the manna (Num. 11: 4-34), at Moses' long stay in the mountain (Ex. 32: 1-35), in the matter of Baal-peor (Num. 25: 1-18), with the fiery serpents (Num. 21: 4-9) and with Korah, Dathan, Abiram, etc. (Num. 16: 1-50) were all while they were encamped and are expressly referred to by St. Paul as typical of our trials (1 Cor. 10: 5-14). Again, the trial of Miriam and Aaron as to Moses' wife and as to Moses himself as God's special mouthpiece occurred while Israel was encamped (Num. 12: 1-16); and this types the trial of certain crown-losers and crown-retainers as to the Church as of lowly origin and as to Jesus as God's special Mouthpiece. Furthermore, the great trial incidental to the report of the ten spies occurred while Israel was encamped (Num. 13: 26—14: 45); and this was typical of a general trial of God's real and nominal people in the Jewish and Gospel Harvests. Every other trial mentioned in Israel's experiences between Egypt and Canaan occurred while they were encamped; and therefore we are warranted in concluding that Israel's encampments represent the passive features of the Christian life.

(33) These consist of three forms of endurance. First, we must successfully bear whatever of pressure our development in head and heart receives. So far as our heads are concerned, the pressure comes from subtle error that, with specious arguments, the adversary through his mouthpieces presents to our minds in an effort to make us victims of a fienzy of delusion, to which in one form or another we will give way, if our

hearts are not full of love for, and loyal to the Truth already learned (2 Thes. 2: 9-12). Often this pressure is very great, not only because of the subtlety of the error, but because of the agent through whom it is presented, who may be one who has been a nourisher of our spiritual life hitherto. When such is the case, the trial is especially severe, as many of us by experiences can testify. Then, our hearts—graces and good sentiments—are subjected to the pressure of sore trial, that may come in a single form, a double form or even in a manifold form, since we must be tested at every point of character. The following are some of the means of our trials: losses, disappointments, delays, restraints, shelvings, our and others' faults and lacks, hardships, necessities, misunderstandings, false brethren, weariness, privations, sickness, poverty, pain, persecution, etc. Singly, doubly and manifoldly our graces and good sentiments are pressed down by these, the adversary offering some relief, if we break down under the test. A second form of endurance comes from pressure borne down upon us from our own humanity, due to our loyalty in study and service. Ordinarily the daily work of the brethren is quite exhausting. If in addition to such weariness we devote our extra time to study and service, increasing weariness will be felt. The head often becomes tired from study, and the head and body not infrequently become weary from service. Not seldom does this weariness result in much loss of sleep and nerve fatigue. In some cases it has extended even to nervous prostration, as is evidenced in our Lord's case by His sweating blood in the garden. More than one through zeal in study and service has made himself sick. And others have deprived themselves of many a comfort in order to render financial support to the work. The Lord puts us into circumstances requiring great self-denial, privation and physical endurance, if we would be faithful to His Truth and its study and service. Those are trials of endurance that come from, and are in our bodies. Finally, endurance as a part of

the Christian life must be shown amid persecution for loyalty to the Truth in its study, service and practice, particularly in its service. Persecution has taken the forms of reviling, slandering, hatred, despite, boycotting, commercially and socially, excommunication, imprisonment, stripes, tortures and even violent death. Many have not been put to the test of the most extreme of these; yet all the faithful must be tested by the pressure of persecution, in some ways at least. And while undergoing such trials, sufferings and persecutions, we are undergoing the antitypes of Israel's encampings the beginnings of their encamping typing the beginnings of our enduring experiences, their continued encampings typing our continued endurances and their breakings up of their encampings typing the endings of our various enduring experiences:

(34) There is a strong corroborative evidence that the cloudy, fiery pillar represents the advancing Truth and its Spirit found by a comparison of the Hebrew in the beginnings of vs. 17 and 18. The first parts of these verses, literally rendered, are respectively as follows; "At the mouth of the cloud's ascending from over the tent . . . the children of Israel journeyed." "At the mouth of the Lord the children of Israel journeyed." These two expressions are in sense synonymous. Therefore the second proves that antitypically the pillar is the Lord's Word and Spirit—His mouthpiece (Ps. 45: 1). The mouth in this case giving a command, the sense is properly though not literally given in v. 18 when it is rendered as in the A. V., "At the commandment of the Lord, etc." Typically v. 18 teaches that it was God who directed all of Israel's journeys, and that it was He who sent them to, and kept them in every station of their journey until He brought them finally to Canaan. Antitypically this suggests that it is God who orders all our steps in our journey to the Kingdom (Ps. 37: 23). He has planned every situation and experience that attend our journey to the Kingdom. This fact guarantees that none of our steps will slide (Ps. 37: 31) nor decline

(Ps. 44: 18), if we follow faithfully His leadings by the antitypical cloudy, fiery pillar. V. 18 also shows that it is at the Lord's command, given through the cloudy, fiery pillar, that Israel encamped. Antitypically this means that it is God who arranges for all our untoward experiences. Nothing happens to us who are His save as He permits; for there are no experiences in the lives of God's saints except as God permits and overrules (Rom. 8: 28). Our Father rules and overrules in all. From Him come our experiences of progress and growth; and from Him come our experiences of endurance of trial, suffering and persecution. However much secondary agents are active therein, God is the primary Worker in all his saints' experiences. V. 18 further shows that it is God who directed the lengths of Israel's stay at their various encampments: "As long as the cloud abode upon the tabernacle, they rested in their tents," *i.e.*, remained encamped. Of course we are not to understand the expression, "they rested in their tents," to mean that no Israelite left his tent, or worked, or did other things than rest in his tent while encamped; for the Bible in passages cited above shows otherwise. But we are to understand the expression to mean that they remained encamped. Their remaining encamped as long as the pillar remained on the tabernacle types the fact that God's people remain under trials, sufferings and persecutions just as long as the Lord is pleased to have them remain so. Let us remain in our trials as long as it pleases the Lord to have us remain therein and not like impatient children seek by hook or crook to escape our trialsome experiences, otherwise we will fail to learn the intended lessons.

(35) Since we are tried, not on what we have not yet developed, but on what we have developed, we infer that our encampments follow our pertinent journeys, *i.e.*, we are tried, made to suffer and are persecuted as to, and on our previous attainments. Therefore we infer that Israel's journeys before an encampment type our growth before our pertinent endurances. V. 19

shows that some of Israel's encampments were greatly prolonged. This types that some of our experiences of endurance are long drawn out. And certainly we who have been in the way a long time know by experience that some of our trials are very long drawn out. Some brethren have experiences of testing along certain lines that have lasted for years, some for ten or even twenty years. From this we can readily recognize the longsuffering and patience of our dear Heavenly Father, and at the same time our slowness to learn, yea, even our stupidity. Surely some of us at such continued keeping at certain trials and very slow learning from them deserve, figuratively speaking, to wear the dunce cap and be put into a corner with our backs toward our fellow pupils. Yet, despite our slowness, He continues His mercy toward us, considering our frame, and remembering that we are dust. And let us therein be like the Israelites, who during a long encampment time remained encamped. That is, let us not resent the length of the experiences of trial, suffering and persecution and give up the antitypical encamping, *i.e.*, cast aside our trials, refuse to learn the lessons that they are calculated to instill; for this would make us leave the Israel of God and wander away from God's people, just as an Israelite would have done in the type, had he refused to remain in Israel's camp as long as the pillar rested on the tabernacle. Rather, like those who remained in Israel's camp and thus remained with God's people, let us with patience persevere in enduring, and that joyfully, the trials, sufferings and persecutions that God apportions to us, realizing that, if faithful therein, the end will be glorious indeed; for these experiences are God's "charge" to us to endure faithfully. Nor will we be given further progress along this pertinent line until the "charge" is "kept."

(36) V. 20 indicates that some of Israel's encampments were but of a few days. Antitypically this means that some experiences of endurance in trial, suffering and persecution are of comparatively short duration.

And we know from experience that this also is true. This as well as long drawn out experiences of endurance, is also of the Lord, even as the middle of v. 20 shows: "According to the commandment of the Lord they abode in their tents: " Thus it is for the Lord, and not for us to decide whether our experiences of endurance be long drawn out or of short duration; for only He knows into what He desires to develop us in detail. Not knowing this, we are incapable of determining when we have been sufficiently tried. It is for us to continue under them in childlike faith, cheerful hope, strong love and full obedience as long as they last, regardless of whether they are of long or short duration. Let us not become restive under them, complaining against them and thus against the Lord, who arranged for them and the length of their duration. It is good for us to remember that in such experiences our strength will be in quietness and confidence. We need not worry about the outcome. We can well rest in, and wait upon the Lord, who will make us of good courage as we wait upon Him. And let the Winter threaten ever so sorely, Spring must and will finally come. Therefore wait, my soul, upon the Lord, and be of good courage, and He will renew thy strength; for another time of progress will in due time come, as it is written in the end of v. 20: "and according to the commandment of the Lord they journeyed." V. 21 shows us that some encampments lasted only over night, and some only over day. This, in the first place, types the fact that some of our experiences of endurance last only a short time indeed.. And our experience abundantly corroborates this. Well were it for us that we could overcome in all of them quickly; for our quickly overcoming proves us to be strong in the pertinent particular, while long-drawn-out experiences of endurance prove us to be more or less weak in the pertinent particular. Well, too, will it be for us, if, like the Israelites, we are ready after a very brief trial to go onward (v. 21); as well as after a longer or the longest experience

of this kind we are ready to go onward (vs. 19, 20). In the second place, it will be well for us if after a night's trial (an experience of endurance along Old Testament lines in the Epiphany) we are ready to go onward in progress with the advancing pillar, as it was well with us if after a day's trial (an experience of endurance along New Testament lines in the Parousia) we were ready to go forward in new developments with the advancing pillar (v. 21).

(37) It will be noted that vs. 19, 20, do not state definitely how many days were involved in the pillar's remaining on the tabernacle. V. 19 indefinitely states the period as of many days, and v. 20 as of a few days. Hence we applied their thoughts as typing generally long and short trials for the Lord's people. But in v. 21 a day-time tarrying and a night-time tarrying of the pillar are specifically mentioned. These we have specifically applied respectively to a Parousia and to an Epiphany experience, as they also apply to a Jewish Harvest experience or to one during the period between the Harvests. Again in v. 22 specific periods are mentioned: two days, a month and a year. We understand the two days to type the two Harvests with their following nights—the whole Gospel-Age—and the tarrying of the Israelites to represent the experiences of endurance on the part of the Church along *common* lines during the two Harvests and their following nights, *i.e.*, during the whole Gospel-Age. 1 Cor. 10: 6-14 is a passage that shows certain experiences of hard pressure to be common to the Lord's people living in these two periods, "upon whom the ends of the Ages have come" (1 Cor. 10: 11). Heb. 3: 2—4: 11 shows this for the interval between the Harvests, and during the Epiphany's miniature Gospel-Ages. The period mentioned as the month's tarrying of the pillar on the tabernacle and the Israelites' remaining camped therein seems to represent the experiences of trial, suffering and persecution to which the twelve graces (Rev. 21: 19, 20) of the Church are subjected, the testing of each being during

its symbolic month. A similar thing is suggested as to the world's developing these twelve graces (Rev. 22: 2). When v. 22 mentions a year as the period for the encampment it seems to type the fact that some experiences of endurance last throughout the entire Gospel-Age irrespective of its periods, *e.g.*, the oppositions of the world, of the nominal people of God and, especially, of the mystery of iniquity, which began to operate during the Jewish Harvest and still continues. The Israelites' encamping during these periods (v. 22) suggests to us the lesson to abide in such trials unto a completion, and their not marching during such periods (v. 22) suggests to us the lesson not to run away from our untoward experiences, since this surely would make us leave the company of God's people, but to abide therein, faithfully with God facing them unto a completion. V. 23 recapitulates the statements of vs. 18 and 19, with the added item that the Lord's commands in these particulars were given by Him through Moses, which types the fact that Jehovah directs all our experiences of development and endurance through the agency of our Lord Jesus, who is both the Interpreter and the Executive of all God's plans and purposes, as well in their generalities as in their details, and this because all things are of the Father and by the Son (1 Cor. 8: 6).

(1) What part of the book of Numbers will we now study? Of what does Num. 9: 1-14 treat? What, generally speaking, is the difference between the original Passover and the annual Passover, so far as concerns their antitypes? What suggests this thought? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? How does this general remark apply as to the first annual Passover, *i.e.*, the one at Sinai ? When will this be pointed out? Why is attention called to this at this point?

(2) What is primarily typed by God's charging Moses to command Israel to celebrate the first annual Passover at Sinai? Secondarily? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What is typed by the charge being given in the *wilderness* of Sinai? Being given in the first month of the

second year? In what relation to this thought is John 6: 32-58? What types the appropriateness of keeping the annual Supper after consecration? How is this further shown? Why so? What correction in the translation of v. 2 is offered? What does it suggest? What is typed by the charge to keep the typical Passover on Nisan 14? Why is this? Why in the two antitypes is this thought also implied?

(3) At what time of the day were the original and the annual lambs slain? What does this suggest for their antitypes? What does the emphasis upon the time of the type imply as to the antitype? What is the proper translation of the words, *chok* and *mishpat*? What does each mean? What is typed by the charge to keep the Passover according to all its statutes? All its ordinances? What were all the statutes in the type and in the antitype of each type? What were all the ordinances in the type and the antitype of each type? How is each proved by the cited Scriptures? What is the translation of Luke 22: 20 required by the Greek? What does this prove to be the Lord's second thought as to the things symbolized by the bread and wine? What does the antitype show as to our explanation of the words *chok* and *mishpat*? What consideration weighs against their A. V. renderings?

(4) What is the difference, type and antitype, between the charges of vs. 2, 3 and that of v. 4? What is typed by the Israelites' annually slaying, roasting and eating the lamb with unleavened bread and bitter herbs? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What is typed by their doing this on Nisan 14? In the wilderness of Sinai? The Israelites' doing it according to all the statutes and ordinances? What additionally is typed by the first annual Passover? During the Gospel-Age? During the Millennium? Where are these things set forth typically?

(5) What do vs. 6-8 give? What is typed by being defiled by the dead body of a man? Who is the dead man? What do we by heredity get from him? Within how long before Nisan 14 were these men in the presence of, or touched a dead person? What is the difference between being in the presence of and touching the dead antitypically? What resulted from this? What does this type? What is typed by the defilement and condemnation lasting

seven days? By the cleansing on the third day? On the seventh day? Whom do they type? What is typed by their coming before Moses and Aaron? What is typed by their coming before them before Moses knew the answer to their question? After what and before what must it have been? Why so? When, accordingly, did the antitype take place?

(6) When did Jesus begin to get the knowledge qualifying Him for His ministry? What was the first of this knowledge? What kind of a knowledge of God's Plan did He have as he emerged from the wilderness? What follows from this? How did the knowledge come to Him? What does this imply first? Why? What does it imply secondly? Why? What does it imply thirdly? Why? What is antityped by His seeing the condemned race standing before His mind's eye?

(7) What thought do we get as to the first annual Supper from the story of the defiled men? What is typed by their being debarred from partaking in the Passover at that time? Their drawing near to Moses and Aaron? What does this not mean that the world did to the Lord in the wilderness? How was the antitypical presentation? What else did the world not then do to the Lord? How did they speak to Him? What thought did their condition suggest to our Lord as to the Gospel-Age salvation? What question was raised in Jesus' mind by their condition? What is typed by this question being asked Moses?

(8) What is typed by Moses' not understanding the answer to this question? By his charging the men to stand by? His looking to hear the Lord's answer? By Jehovah's giving the answer? By His charge to tell His answer to Israel? Of what two classes did God's answer treat? What is the difference between them, type and antitype? Generally speaking, how do the antitypes differ? From what are both of them excluded? What is reserved for them? What is typed by the expression, "of you or of your posterity"?

(9) What is the difference in the time of the clean and unclean Israelites' keeping Passover? What does the night of Nisan 14 type? What have the clean antitypical Israelites been doing during this antitypical night? What could the antitypically defiled then not do? When will the world have its Passover? What does this mean? What is typed by the 14th of the second month? What will the world be

doing then? What, therefore, do the two Passover keepings of the second year of Israel's departure from Egypt type? What are the three thoughts associated with its antitypes? What is typed by the defiled class slaying the Passover lamb between the evenings? Who will be the first to enter into keeping the Millennial Passover? Who will constitute the Epiphany camp? How will they be prepared for the Millennial Passover? As what will the return of the Worthies serve to them? Into what will they at that signal *immediately* enter? Of what is this time element the antitype? How will doing this between the two evenings find its fulfillment with the rest of the restitutionists living and dead?

(10) What is typed by the defiled ones eating the Passover with unleavened bread? How will it be as compared with ours? Of what will their bitter herbs consist? Of what kind of bitter herbs will they not partake? Why will these be lacking in theirs? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What will their bitter herbs be? Why will they have them? Why will they be bitter to them?

(11) What does v. 12 type as to eating the Millennial Lamb? What is the similarity and the difference in this respect as to our and the world's Lamb? How, in general, do we reconcile the statements of Ex. 12: 10 and Num. 9: 12? What is typed by the charge of each verse as to leaving some of the Lamb over until morning? What are the details on this for our Age? For the Millennial Age? What are the dissimilarities and likenesses on this matter so far considered?

(12) What is the main difference in the typical teachings of these two verses? To what does this difference not amount? To what is the difference due? What is not done with all of Christ's merit during the Gospel-Age? What is done with a part of it? With the rest of it? What results therefrom at the end of this Age? How is this related to the part of the lamb left over in Ex. 12: 10? What is typed by its being burned by fire? What are the details that belong to this thought? What is meant by the imputable merit ceasing to exist? Why will there be no burning of the Lamb's remains after the Millennium? What results therefrom to those who sin during the Little Season. Why?

(13) What is the character also of the statement that none of the lamb's bones be broken? As an exhortation

when does it antitypically apply? What is done when a lamb's bones are broken? In what two ways may the antitypical Lamb's bones be broken? What do the Ransom deniers do with Christ? Those returning to wallow in the mire of sin? How do the cited Scriptures prove these things? At what times do these antitypes occur? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What is typed by the exhortation not to break a bone of the lamb? How do the antitypical exhortations of vs. 12 and 3 compare as to the statutes and ordinances? In only what way do they differ? What is implied in the singular of the word *statute* in v. 12? Why? What similar usage do we have with the English word *law*? What word that might be expected to occur in this verse does not there occur? Why does it not there occur?

(14) What threat is held out in v. 13? Against what two classes? Under what conditions only? During what Ages does it antitypically apply? Who are the Gospel-Age clean? Who are the Gospel-Age non-wayfarers? What privilege do they alone have during the Gospel-Age? What is meant by their not keeping Passover? In a word, how may they be summed up? Who are the clean of the Millennial Age? Who are its non-wayfarers? What will happen to these two classes if they do not keep the Millennial Passover? When will those simply enlightened, but not fully cleansed, who so refuse perish? The cleansed and enlightened? What is the typical reason given for this? What does it mean in the antitype? How will this leave them before God's justice? What is the result?

(15) What antitypical explanation has in The Present Truth been given of the strangers in the land? In what articles and passages? What is typed by their dwelling in the land? Their not being born there? Of whom does v. 14 treat antitypically? How must they do in keeping the Passover, compared with the begotten of the present time? According to what two things must they keep it? What is implied in keeping it according to the ordinance? The statute? What is typed by the statement that there is one law to the stranger and to the native born? What are the details here? Wherein is there no difference? Wherein is there a difference? What must both classes alike do? What peculiarity belongs to the Youthful Worthies in the keeping of antitypical Passover?

(16) Of what does the second part of Num. 9 treat? Read the main Biblical references to the cloudy, fiery pillar. What is the first proof that it is typical? The second? The third? The fourth? What conclusion do these four reasons warrant? What does the Bible not specifically mention as to its typical signification? What three Biblical things show its typical meaning? What is its typical significance? How is this shown by its leading Israel from Egypt to Canaan? How do the cited Scriptures prove this use of it? How does 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2 prove this antitype? How does God's speaking and acting from out of it prove this antitype? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What conclusion may we draw from these three methods of proof?

(17) What reason corroborates this conclusion? By what do God's people gain life? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What leads them on their way? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What results from not having the Truth? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What, additionally, leads God's people? What is its relation to giving life? How do the cited Scriptures prove that the Spirit also gives life? What is the second thing in this connection that the Spirit does? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What results from the absence of the Spirit's operation? How do the cited Scriptures show this? What two things occur in the real baptism? How do the cited passages prove this? How do the cited Scriptures prove that God speaks and acts from out of the Truth and its Spirit? What conclusion follows from the Scriptures and facts given in this paragraph on the antitype of the cloudy, fiery pillar? What corroborates the conclusion? In what particular does this pillar type the Truth and its Spirit?

(18) What does v. 15 first state? Ex. 40: 33, 34? What does the tabernacle represent? In what three capacities? What does the tabernacle in the wilderness usually represent? Solomon's temple? How also do we find the words *tabernacle* and *temple* applied? How do the cited passages prove this? What is the antitype of the tabernacle in v. 15? What, accordingly, is its antitypical day? What is typed by the rearing up of the tabernacle? As what? Previous to what did it not exist? When did the antitypical court, its altar and laver, the first vail and the High Priest stooping

under it first come into existence? What came into existence at Jesus' begettal? At His death? Resurrection? What has come into existence for the Church since Pentecost through her justification and consecration? Through her Spirit-begettal ? What has been going on since then as member after member has had these three experiences? When were the antitypical court and Holy completed, so far as the Church is concerned? How long has the antitypical second vail been in process of erection? When will it be completed? Since when and by what have the antitypical Most Holy and chest of the Ark been coming into existence for the Church? When will these be completed? What in brief is typed in v. 15 by the erection of the tabernacle? What is the time for this work? What does this prove as to the day of v. 15? How do the cited Scriptures show this?

(19) What is typed by the cloudy, fiery pillar covering the tabernacle? What does this mean? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What has been the Christ's peculiar prerogative? How is this shown positively and negatively in this type? To whom does this sound absurd? Despite this, what is true in this connection ? What is implied by her being the depository of the Truth and its Spirit? How will this be, despite the world's denials and railings? How is it by contrast to the esteemed? What attitude does this give us toward the advantage of the world's most favored ones?

(20) What is the character of the day and night of v. 15? How many symbolic days and nights have there been in the Gospel-Age? What are the first day and night mentioned in paragraph 5? How do the cited Scriptures prove them to be such? How do 1 Cor. 3: 13 and Eph. 6: 13 also prove this? What is the night of Is. 21: 11, 12? What is implied as to its preceding day? How are these two periods set forth in John 9: 4? What is its second application? Why so? What do these two periods give us? What is the natural basis for the figure of these symbolic days and nights? What use, accordingly, does the Bible make of the symbolic sun and moon? How do the cited Scriptures show this? What names respectively would thus be given to the periods when each shines?

(21) When, self-evidently, did the symbolic sun shine? What two facts prove this? What results from this? What

does this fact not exclude? How, relatively, did these two kinds of light then shine? What phenomenon of nature illustrates this? What does an examination of our Pastor's writings disclose? Why so? What will quickly show this? What New Testament writings were produced after the Jewish Harvest? How is this fact illustrated in the figure under study? What set in thereafter, lasting until the Gospel Harvest? How do the historical facts bear out this figure? Whose writings prove this? How did each one of these stand in relation to the star of his respective period? What is the reason for their writing mainly on Old Testament themes? From what two sources did the papacy mainly draw to form its errors? What are the main features of its counterfeit? What did this fact force the members of the four mentioned stars to do as to the Old Testament?

(22) What was not shining between the two Harvests? What implies this? In whose writings is this illustrated? What did their partial understanding of Old Testament passages enable them to do? What did this serve to accomplish? What part of the night set in during the Sardis and Philadelphia periods? What in nature illustrates such a long dawn? For what will this account? How did this proceed? What was the condition from this standpoint during the times of the last three members of the Philadelphia star? Who were these? What kind of a moon is shining in the Epiphany night? For what facts will this account? What is to be expected before it is over? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What third day follows the Epiphany night? How does its dawn differ from the Millennial Dawn as used by our Pastor? What will then come to the fore, as suggested by the figure under study? On what New Testament book will this light come? What will its exposition incidentally do? What does this figure show as to the time of its coming, negatively and positively? What will this time consideration allow?

(23) In what kind of a Gospel-Age are we now? What, accordingly, is to be expected to shine now? Why is it unreasonable now to expect the symbolic sun to shine? On what ground do the Levites criticize the Epiphany Priests? For what do they ask instead? What reply do we make to them? How do we reply on their criticism of our use of types? If they continue their demands for

New Testament light and their depreciations of Old Testament types, how do we further answer them? What cannot be done with either sun? Among whom can such clamorers and critics not be numbered? Why not? How is this indicated? As what do they do this symbolic barking? How is their course illustrated in nature? What thing in nature symbolizes the braying of the Levite leaders at the Epiphany full moon light? How are the Parousia and Epiphany lights to be viewed relatively? What is our attitude to be now toward the Epiphany light? What three reasons should effect this? What should we, therefore, do about it? Like whom should we not be? Why not?

(24) What may some say of our explaining the operations of the symbolic sun and moon in connection with our discussing the antitypical cloudy, fiery pillar? What reply may be given to them? What, then, is the relation between the symbolic sun and moon and the antitypical cloudy, fiery pillar? What different operations do these two sets of figures respectively bring out? Why can we appropriately call the cloudy, fiery pillar the manifestation of God's presence with Israel? What is a summary of our findings as to the Gospel-Age day times and night times? And of their symbolic suns and moons, or pillars of cloud and fire? What other day and night will there be in God's plan? What will be that day's cloudy pillar? That night's fiery pillar? How do the cited Scriptures prove this third day and night? How does Ex. 13: 20-22 stand related to that day time? What will never again come after the Little Season? Why not?

(25) How does Num. 9: 16 read? What two things are found in v. 16? What is set forth in this verse? What is its antitype? How has this been in the past? How will it be in the future? In what four periods has this proven true? For whom was this fulfilled? What contrasts do we find in this connection? What does this guarantee for the future? What proves this? Why is this true, according to God's design? To what should such faithfulness lead us? How has it exercised itself?

(26) What differences as to the pillar's distinctness existed for various Israelites? What two reasons account for this? Who dwelt and served nearest it? What did this effect? Who saw it the next clearly? Why? Who

saw it with the least clearness? Why? What is the antitype of these three modes of seeing the pillar? What is the reason for these three differences? What other cause existed for differences of sight in the type and antitype? How is this illustrated among Priests? Levites? Campers, in type and antitype? How in this respect are some in the antitypical camp? How may this matter be summarized? What does this suggest? What results therefrom?

(27) What verses does v. 17 give in a summary? What does it show? What is the character of this statement? What two things furnish the answer to the meaning of the pillar's starting, proceeding and stopping? What is typed by the pillar's beginning to move? Why is this answer true? What is typed by the pillar's proceeding? Why is this answer true? What is typed by its halting? Why is this answer true? What is a summary of this line of thought? What two things would it necessarily have? How is each typed? What is brought to our attention thereby? How do the cited passages prove this? What peculiarity has Biblical Truth? Why is this? In contrast with what does Biblical Truth in this respect stand? How should this difference affect our course toward them?

(28) What pertinent remark has been made of the Bible? What pertinent characteristic has the Bible? Of what is this one of the surest proofs? Why so? Why is this reason true? What results from this? Why is this not a fanciful claim? Why has the Bible the quality of progressive adaptability? How does Jesus minister in this matter? What other reason is there for this Biblical quality? How does the meaning of Amos 3: 7 show this? What follows from this?

(29) What characteristic has every part of the Bible? Who are the main agents advancing God's plan? What two facts imply this? When do such things of the Bible speak out? What does it thereby prove itself to be? How is this Biblical feature related to the cloudy, fiery pillar? When does it cease so to speak? How is this typed? What kind of a process is this, from man's viewpoint? What is the force of Is. 28: 9, 10 in this connection? According to the connection, what is the reason for the course outlined in Is. 28: 9, 10? For the unfaithful? For the faithful? What lesson should we learn from this peculiarity of the Word?

(30) What else is typical in v. 17? What were Israel's actions recorded in v. 17? What fact will clarify their antitypical significance? How, briefly stated, is this proven by the two cited Scriptures? Show from the cited Scriptures how the Christian life is a walk, a journey, and that they are here strangers and pilgrims. How is our advancing away from symbolic Egypt toward antitypical Canaan typed by Israel's wilderness journey? What antitypical application may therefrom be deduced? By what three steps especially do we progress toward antitypical Canaan? What is the thing typed by Israel's marches toward Canaan? Why is this true? Why is this reason true? Where will we stand at the completion of this course? What hymn explains this antitype? Please at this point of the lesson sing it.

(31) What three things cover completely the active part of the Christian life? What will prove this thought? What did Israel's various marches type as to these three things? In what order did we develop these three? How was our learning the Truth typed by the marching Israelites? Our ministries ? Our practicing the Word in grace? What is the fire prerequisite of our successful journey to heavenly Canaan? What was the course of those Israelites who would not look at the cloudy, fiery pillar? What does this teach us? What other two pertinent things should we do? Against what should we guard ourselves? How are the three stages of our progress in the Christian life typed by Israel's marches?

(32) Additional to these three active features of the Christian life, what other features has it? What must it endure? How do the cited Scriptures prove these three passive parts of the Christian life? Of what are they expressive? What else beside marching did the Israelites do on the way to Canaan? What do these represent? What two things suggest the truthfulness of this application? How does Eph. 6: 13 show the second of these? What third proof shows this? How is this shown in Ex. 14: 2-20 ? Num. 11: 4-34 ? Ex. 32: 1-35 ? Num. 25: 1-18 ? Num. 21: 4-9? Num. 16: 1-50? How are these five cases expounded in 1 Cor. 20: 5-14? How is this further shown in Num. 12: 1-16? Num. 13: 26—14: 45? What other consideration corroborates this? What conclusion are we warranted in drawing from these facts?

(33) Of how many forms of endurance does the passive part of the Christian life consist? What is the first of these? How does endurance show itself as to our heads? Under what circumstance will one fail in a trial of his head? How does 2 Thes. 2: 9-12 prove this? In what two ways are such trials often very subtle? Why is the second way often very hard to endure? What else besides our heads must be tried? What variety is there in such trials? Why so? What are some of the means of such trials? How does the adversary offer some relief in such trials? Describe the second form of our endurance. What makes this often especially exhausting? What effects has such exhaustion been known to work? Who especially illustrates this? What does the Lord do to make such trials all the more crucial? What in us is especially taxed by this second form of endurance? What is the third form of endurance in the Christian? What brings on persecution? By what means is it brought? What have many faithful brethren not experienced? What must they all undergo? While undergoing trials, sufferings and persecutions, what are we antityping? What is typed by the Israelites' beginnings, continuances in, and breakings up of their encampments?

(34) What strong corroborative evidence that the cloudy, fiery pillar types the Truth and its Spirit is found in a comparison of the literal translations of the beginnings of vs. 17 and 18? What are these literal translations? How are they related in sense? What do they prove? Why? According to v. 18, who directed all Israel's journeys and stations? What does this type? What does Ps. 37: 23 teach in this connection? What, taught in Ps. 37: 31 and 44: 18, does this guarantee? On what condition? What else does v. 18 show? What does this type? What, therefore, comes from the Lord? Despite what? What third thing does v. 18 show? What are we not to understand the last clause of v. 18 to mean? Why not? How are we to understand the expression? What is typed by this clause? What lesson does it teach?

(35) On what are we not tried? On what are we tried? What follows therefrom? What do we infer from this fact? What does v. 19 show of some of Israel's encampments? What does this type? What does experience

show on this point? What are some examples of such long-drawn-out trials? What things in God and in us are thereby discernible? What figurative treatment do some of us for this deserve? What qualities in God operate in this connection? What did the Israelites' long remaining in camp type? What lessons should we learn from this? What would not so doing effect? How should we receive and endure our untoward experiences? Why? What will be withheld from us until we endure faithfully?

(36) What does v. 20 indicate? What does this type? What corroborates this? From whom are our short untoward experiences? How is this typed? Whose is it and whose it is not to decide on the lengths of our experiences? Why should God and not we decide the lengths and kinds of our trials? What is ours to do therein? Against what should we guard ourselves in these experiences? What will therein be good for us to remember? What should we therein avoid and practice? What natural phenomenon suggests hope in, and waiting on the Lord therein? What will in due time follow? How does v. 20 suggest this? What does v. 21 suggest? What does this type? What corroborates this? What would be well for us in this respect? Why? What do long-drawn-out trials suggest? What else would be well for us? After what three-time kinds of trials? In what third way would it be well for us in this connection? In what way was it well for us in connection with this line of thought?

(37) What do vs. 19, 20, not definitely *state*? How do they respectively state the duration of the encampments? How, accordingly, did we apply them? How does v. 21 state the duration of the encampments? How, accordingly, did we apply its day and its night? How does v. 22 express itself on this point? How do we understand its two days antitypically? How does 1 Cor. 10: 6-14 show this thought? What seems to be typed by the *month's* tarrying in the camp? How do the cited passages corroborate this thought? What is typed by the year's tarrying of v. 22? What are some illustrations on this point? What lesson is suggested by Israel's tarrying these periods? By their not therein marching? What does v. 23 do mainly? What additional thought does it give? What does this type? How does He do therein?

CHAPTER X.

THE GOSPEL-AGE TRUMPETS AND MARCHES. Num. 10.

THE TWO GOSPEL-AGE TRUMPETS. THEIR USES. THEIR USERS. GOSPEL-AGE MARCHES. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

THE thought-connection between this and the last chapter is this: Both the antitypical cloudy, fiery pillar and the two trumpets of Num. 10: 1-10 refer to the Word of God, though the viewpoints are somewhat different. The former presents God's Word and Spirit from the standpoint of leading God's people, the latter from the standpoint of its proclamations arousing them to certain actions. But each of them refers to the good Word of God. In Bible symbols a trumpet is used to type a message; and blowing a trumpet in Bible symbols represents the proclamation of a message. That the two trumpets of Num. 10: 1-10 are typical is evident from their being a part of the law and tabernacle arrangements, all of which were typical (Heb. 9: 1-28; 10: 1). Quite a number of Scriptures suggest that a trumpet symbolizes a message, and its sounding symbolizes the proclamation of a message. Thus the trumpet that sounded long (Ex. 19: 13, 16, 19) at the inauguration of the Law Covenant represents the Truth proclamations of the seventh trumpet, connected with the inauguration of the New Covenant. The sounding of the Jubilee trumpet (Lev. 25: 9), proclaiming liberty to the land and to the inhabitants thereof, beautifully types the proclamation of the restitution message made by the Priests from 1874 to 1914. The seven priests who sounded the trumpets while Jericho was being encircled (Joshua 6: 4-9, 13, 16, 20) represent the same as the seven angels with the trumpets of Rev. 8: 2-6, and their sounding them represents the same as these

seven angels' blowing their trumpets, which, we know, represents the proclamations of the seven angels' messages. Gideon blowing his trumpet (Judg. 6: 34) types our Lord proclaiming the Gospel message throughout this Age, while he and the 300 blowing their trumpets at the first battle (Judg. 7: 16, 18-22) represent our Lord and the faithful Little Flock giving out the message against the Divine right of rulers, clergy and aristocrats, from 1914 to 1916. The following passages are a few others, from among many, that give the same thought: Ps. 47: 4-6; 81: 1-4; 150: 3; Is. 18: 3, compare with vs. 2-7; 27: 12, 13; Jer. 6: 16, 17; 51: 27; Ezek. 7: 14; Hos. 8: 1; Joel 2: 1, 15; Zeph. 1: 14-18; Zech. 9: 14; Matt. 24: 31; 1 Cor. 15: 52; Rev. 1: 10; 4: 1. Hymn No. 24 sings this symbolic thought with a beautiful explanation of the type. It might be well to sing it here in order to impress the thought better on our hearts and minds.

(2) It will be noted (v. 2) that Moses was commanded to make the two trumpets. Here, as almost everywhere else in Numbers, Moses represents our Lord as God's Executive. His making these two trumpets types our Lord's developing two Gospel-Age messages. Doubtless Moses made these trumpets through Bezaleel (in *the shadow of God*) and Aholiab (*his father's tent*), assisted by their companions (Ex. 31: 2-6). Bezaleel types our Lord in His capacity of developing the Church and all its pertinent teachings. Aholiab represents the members of the seven stars, used by the Lord as special assistants in developing the Church and its teachings, while their assistants represent the scribes instructed unto the kingdom, bringing forth things new and old, consisting of general and special helpers of the members of the seven stars (Matt. 13: 52). The trumpets' being made of silver represents the fact that the antitypical proclaimed messages would be true. Their being made of but one whole piece represents several things: (1) that they are

taken from but one source, the Bible as God's Word (John 17: 17; 2 Tim. 3: 15-17); and (2) that they are in harmony with each other as parts of a harmonious whole (Is. 8: 20; 2 Pet. 1: 19-21). This raises the question, What are these two messages proclaimed during the Gospel Age? We are safe in inferring that they are the two most important messages given during the Gospel Age, because of the emphasis laid upon them by the fact that they are referred to in the first part of Numbers, which sets forth typically the chief things in the arrangements of God's nominal and real spiritual Israel during the Gospel Age. And what are the two most important themes of the Gospel Age? They may be said to be the message of the human salvation and the message of the Divine salvation. Or we may put it in another form having the same meaning: restitution (reckoned and actual) and the high calling. It is these that are referred to as the wonderful songs—the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb (Rev. 15: 3, 4).

(3) As a matter of fact, the human salvation (restitution, actual or reckoned) is, generally speaking, a summary of the Old Testament message, which is, generally speaking, the song of Moses; for in its wide sense it includes as its presuppositions, nature and consequences, most of what is in the Old Testament. Most of what is revealed in the Old Testament is more or less directly connected with it. Thus it implies man's original creation in perfection, his trial for life and his fall into sin and death. It likewise implies his experience with evil; and it implies the experimental proof, furnished by the Gentiles, left to their unaided selves, and by the Jews, assisted by the Law Covenant and favoring providences, that fallen man cannot save himself, and therefore is dependent on Divine power for salvation. It further implies the propriety of man's exercising repentance as an evidence that he earnestly desires, and does what he can to obtain salvation. It

also implies that God's grace provided a Redeemer who is able to satisfy the demands of Justice against the repentant and believing sinner, and make him reckonedly just during the Gospel Age and actually just during the next Age. It also implies that during the Gospel Age man may exercise reformation toward God to the best of his ability and heartily trust, appropriate and act upon the promise of God for the sake of the merit of Jesus to forgive him his sins, to impute Christ's righteousness to him and to receive him into fellowship as a friend. Thereby one obtains reckoned justification or reckoned restitution. And, finally, the human salvation implies actual justification, or restitution to all that was lost in Adam and redeemed in Christ. These things, it will be readily recognized, are a general summary of most of the Old Testament teachings. It is this message, and its implications, that are typed by the first of the two trumpets of Num. 10.

(4) Again, as a matter of fact, the Divine salvation, or the high calling, is, generally speaking, a summary of the New Testament, which is, generally speaking, the song of the Lamb. Like the human salvation, it has many implications and inseparable accompaniments, which must be considered as belonging indirectly to it. Thus it implies that Christ is made to its recipients wisdom, in that He teaches them all that is presupposed and implied in, belongs to and flows out of the high calling. It implies that He vitalizes their reckoned justification in order to make them fit candidates for the high calling. It concentrates itself in the sanctification of the humanity and the New Creature of those in the high calling. On account of this, it shows and works itself out in maintaining deadness to self and the world and aliveness to God while putting the humanity to death sacrificially on behalf of God's cause. As to the New Creature, it begins with the begettal of the Spirit, proceeds through its quickening, growth, strengthening, balancing, crystallization and birth.

Then, too, in deliverance He rescues the New Creature from sin, error, selfishness, worldliness, Satan and death. The high calling includes the New Creation's predestination, organization, order, discipline, law, rest, trial, baptism, passover, obligations toward man socially and toward the brethren, its foes and besetments and its present and future inheritance. These things, it will also be at once recognized, are a summary of the main New Testament teachings. And this message, and its implications, are symbolized by the second trumpet of Num. 10.

(5) Then there are certain other lines of thought in the Old and New Testaments that belong to either of these messages, dependent on the application made of them. *E.g.*, the kingdom, if considered from the standpoint of reigning over and blessing mankind, belongs to the song of Moses; if considered from the standpoint of the glorious privileges of the Christ, it belongs to the song of the Lamb. Again, the Second Advent considered in its relation to the overthrow of Satan's empire and the blessing of mankind with restitution belongs to the song of Moses; but considered in its relation to the reaping of the saints, their deliverance and glorification, it belongs to the song of the Lamb. So, too, the resurrection in so far as it is unto human perfection belongs to the song of Moses; but in so far as it is unto the Divine nature it belongs to the song of the Lamb. Then there are very many types and prophecies in the Old Testament pertinent to Christ and the Church, both while in the flesh and while in the spirit, which belong to the song of the Lamb (1 Cor. 10: 1-14; Heb. 3: 10; 1 Pet. 1: 10-13). But these are often presented from the standpoint of their relations to the human salvation, though not a few of them are not so presented. Again, there are some things in the New Testament that concern the human salvation both in its reckoned and in its actual aspects, *i.e.*, not only reckoned restitution (justification by faith) but

also actual restitution. It is because these two parts of the Bible, so far as subject matter is concerned, lap into each other, as just shown, that we remarked above that *generally speaking* the Old Testament is the song of Moses and that *generally speaking* the New Testament is the song of the Lamb. But these two trumpets do not respectively typically cover these exceptions; they respectively exclude them. They are, therefore, not absolutely synonymous, one with the Old, and the other with the New Testament. But antitypically one of these does exclude high calling matters not applied in restitution respects and the other does exclude restitution matters not applied in high calling respects. Thus, while the Old and New Testaments do not exclude things that, strictly speaking, do not specifically belong to their respective general themes, the antitypical two trumpets do, strictly speaking, exclude such things. But these two messages so twine and intertwine into each other as to be in perfect harmony. They are, in fact, the two greatest features practically realized in the Divine plan. It is these mutual relations between them that prove them to be of a *whole* piece of antitypical silver.

(6) Vs. 2-7 also show the uses to which they were put. These we find to be two: (1) calling the assembly, and (2) journeying of the camps, *i.e.*, the blowing of the trumpets would call the people or the princes to Moses at the door of the tabernacle (vs. 3, 4) and the blowing of the trumpets would signal the four encampments of Israel to start out on their journeys. What is meant by calling the assembly to the door of the tabernacle? In the type it was to gather them before the Lord to the end that they give their attention to something pertinent to the Lord. It will be noted that the assembly was called by the blowing of both trumpets, not by that of one (v. 3); while the princes were gathered to Moses at the door of the tabernacle by the blowing of but one of them. The assembly, of course,

types the nominal people of God, while the princes represent the crown-lost leaders among God's nominal people. We think that the difference between the blowing of both antitypical trumpets and the blowing of one antitypical trumpet is this: the blowing of both trumpets represents giving God's nominal people generalities only on the two parts of God's plan, while the blowing of one trumpet represents the giving of details on a particularized feature of God's plan. The reason why we believe that the above distinction is true is that the facts of the involved conditions in these two classes seem to require it. The nominal people of God at best know but little of the things of God; hence they need the generalities, if they are to be helped; while, if given the details, they would be unable to take them in, and would thus be stumbled. Experience shows this: *e.g.*, in our public meetings we do not attempt to give details to those of the public who attend them. We give them only generalities. This, *e.g.*, is the case in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle.

(7) Still more do we see this to have been the case while the Church during the Parousia had the mouthpieceship toward the world. We gave them simple talks, like chart talks and others, in which we sought to make the general features of the plan (the human and the Divine salvations) plain to them. This also showed itself in the volunteer, colporteur, photo-drama, newspaper and pastoral work, as well as in our conversations with the nominal people of God. It was only when some of them were drawn into the Truth that we would go into detail with them on any particular subject. But in the type when the princes of the thousands (v. 4), which would include not only the twelve princes over the tribes, but also those of their subordinates who were captains over the thousands (Num. 31: 14 [the word here translated *captains* is the word usually translated *princes* and is the same word as is used in Num. 7 for the twelve leaders of the twelve

tribes]), met Moses in a private, not a public way, they typed the new-creaturely leaders among the nominal people of God being gathered to our Lord by a more particularized treatment, which would imply that only one general subject would be discussed, *i.e.*, blowing on but one trumpet. And the facts of experience prove that this is just what happened in our contacts as the Lord's mouthpieces with such leaders. Their mentality required going into details so as to meet their mental needs and their difficulties; and giving details precludes covering many subjects, rather it requires lengthy discussions of certain features of but one subject—blowing on one trumpet. Some of us during the Parousia had considerable opportunities to discuss details of certain features of the plan with such new-creaturely leaders among the nominal people of God, and know that we had to limit our discussions to particularities in order to meet their difficulties.

(8) These two kinds of gatherings served various purposes. With the nominal people of God they partook, in the first place, of a witness to the kingdom, which made us stress general high calling and restitution truths (Matt. 24: 14). Then we had also before them to reprove for sin and righteousness, as well as for the kingdom [judgment] (John 16: 8-11). This implied the preaching of repentance and the rebuking of the errors of the nominal church; and as these errors were against both the Divine and the human salvations, we had to mention things pertinent to these. These same things, though with less clearness, were likewise witnessed to by our dear priestly brethren who lived in the Jewish Harvest and in the time between the Jewish and Gospel Harvests. Thus such calling of general assemblies occurred throughout the Gospel Age. It is even yet occurring in our work as conversationalists, volunteers, sharpshooters, colporteurs, elders, evangelists, extension workers, and pilgrims, as we engage in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, in John's Rebuke,

in Elijah's Letter and in the Double Herald work. And, finally, so far as the nominal people of God have been concerned, this work of assembling them before the Lord had the purpose of drawing such of them as were amenable to repentance and faith to justification and with those so drawn the effort was later made to lead them to consecration. Then, there were various purposes connected with the private assemblings of the antitypical princes. They almost invariably occurred by methods of conversation, reading of the literature and correspondence, especially the first and second of these. One of these purposes was to draw amenable ones to the Truth, which in some cases proved successful; another was an educational one, to help them to measurably clearer views, which they in turn would give to others. *E.g.*, before 1874 almost all crown-lost princes were post-Millennialists. But during the reaping time a goodly part of them became pre-Millennialists. However, as such, almost none of them accepted the thought that the Millennium was to benefit the non-elect dead. To them an opportunity for the non-elect dead seemed to be a "dangerous doctrine." However, even their brand of Millennialism is better than that of post-Millennialism; for they helped not a few to love the Second Coming who formerly feared it; and they helped a few among them toward the Truth on the subject of the Millennium. And, doubtless, a third purpose in such private assembling to the Lord was to prepare such crown-lost ones for the opening of their eyes after their fleshly minds would be destroyed. A final purpose therein was undoubtedly to warn such of them as were becoming more and more oppositional to the Truth against the danger of their course, a warning that some of them doubtless have taken, and that others of them have refused to take—with fatal results to themselves.

(9) It will be noted that vs. 5-7 show that there were two kinds of blowing on the trumpets. One of

these is described negatively, but is not defined. The other is defined as an alarm. An alarm blown on a trumpet represents the proclamation of a controversial message. That this is true can be seen in a passage that we have already briefly explained (Num. 31: 6). The Hebrew noun here translated *alarm is teruah*; and the Hebrew verb translated *to blow an alarm* is *rua*, from which *teruah* is derived; while the Hebrew verb used here as meaning *to blow*, apart from an alarm, is *taka*. Besides vs. 3, 4 and 7, we find in Ps. 81: 3 a good illustration of the use of the latter word as contrasted with *rua* and its noun derivative, *teruah*. One of the best examples that the latter two words mean *blowing an alarm* typing the proclaiming of a controversial message, is found in v. 9, later to be explained, when we come to it in this chapter. Another very fine example proving that *teruah* means an alarm in the sense of controversy in the type and antitype is found in Num. 31: 6, where our Pastor's controversial messages toward the nominal-church errorists during the reaping time are typed. The following are some passages in which the verb *rua* in the typical sense of proclaiming a controversial message is used: Joshua 6: 10, 16, 20; Joel 2: 1; 1 Sam. 4: 5; while the following passages use the noun *teruah* typically in the sense of the proclamation of a controversial message: Joshua 6: 5, 20; 1 Sam. 4: 5; Zeph. 1: 16; 2 Sam. 6: 15; Amos 1: 14; Jer. 4: 19; 49: 2. Not only do these Scriptures prove such to be the thought underlying the martial use of these words, but the facts of the antitype of the camp's starting to march proves it. In studying the Gospel-Age cloudy, fiery pillar, we saw that the marching of Israel represents, among other things, advance in knowledge, as the advance of the pillar types the progressive unfolding of the Truth. But ordinarily, under what circumstances is it that the Truth progresses? As our Pastor has frequently pointed out it usually is amid controversies.

(10) We might point out some illustrations in proof of this. It was amid the Ransom controversy that Lev. 16 became clear to our Pastor, and thus almost the whole tabernacle. Indeed, during that controversy the Ransom doctrine became wonderfully clarified. It was during the Sin-offerings, Covenants and Mediator controversy that these subjects became wonderfully clarified. It was during the Infidelism controversy that the Ransom in relation to Adam and Jesus became clearer, and the universal salvation from the Adamic condemnation, as distinct from eternal universal salvation, became clear. It was during the Second Advent controversy that the Second Advent's time, object and manner became wondrously clear. This opening of Truth amid controversy, *e.g.*, is typically shown, among other places, by the Lord's glory (His wisdom, justice, love and power, as manifest in the Truth is His antitypical glory) suddenly blazing forth on the tabernacle (Num. 11: 25; 12: 5, 10; 14: 10; 16: 19, etc.). It is also evident in the unfolding of the Epiphany Truth. It was during the controversies of the 1917 separation that Elijah's and Elisha's last related acts became clear. The sixth sifting and the slaughter weapons were at that time clarified and the murmuring of the penny parable also became clear. In our annual report we pointed out how the circumstances of the controversy on Ruth, type and antitype, led to Ruth 3 and 4 becoming clear to us in generality and detail, as well as the details of Ruth 1 and 2, whose generalities had for several years before been clear to us. In our controversy with J.F.R. vast parts of Scriptures hitherto not clear to us became clear. We might instance the main parts of Zech. 11, Matt. 24: 48-51 and many other things. Our controversy with Adam Rutherford occasioned the midnight of the ten virgins parable and numerous things about the firstfruit types becoming clear. How vast is the amount of Epiphany Truth that has become clarified through the Great Company and Youthful Worthies

controversy! We do not recall a single controversy into which we have become involved, amid which our need of further light set in, that some advancing light did not come. This has been the experience of God's people all through the Age. Yea, God made the Bible so that it would shed its advancing light through our Lord's ministry as the circumstances, needs and experiences of God's people required.

(11) Accordingly, the trumpet alarm was sounded to cause the camps to move forward. The first of such trumpet alarms (v. 5) was to signal the advance of the camps to the front of the tabernacle—Judah, Issachar and Zebulun. This alarm types the proclamation of a controversial message on God's Power as it affected the teachings of the Calvinistic, Campbellite and Second Adventist Churches; and these camps' marching represents these denominations controverting on the special aspect of power, often as centered in their stewardship doctrines. At the second trumpet alarm the camps to the tabernacle's south advanced, *viz.*, Reuben, Simeon and Gad. This alarm represents the proclamation of a controversial message centering in God's Wisdom as it affected the teachings of the Greek, Roman and Anglican Churches. And these camps' advancing represents these denominations controverting, usually on the special aspects of wisdom in their stewardship doctrines. While Num. 10 does not specifically speak of the soundings of the third and fourth alarms, apart from the general summary at the end of v. 6, this was not due to their not sounding, but to the fact that their recording was not necessary, seeing these soundings were self-evident. That the third and fourth encampments marched is recorded in vs. 22-27. Hence we know from this and other recordings of Israel's journeys that the third and fourth trumpet alarms were sounded. Accordingly, the third blast aroused the third encampment, that to the west, to march, *viz.*, Ephraim, Manasseh and Benjamin. This blast typed the proclamation

of a controversial message along the lines of God's Justice, often on the special aspects of the stewardship doctrines of the Lutheran, Congregational and Quaker, etc., Churches; and the marching of the pertinent typical tribes typed these denominations entering into a controversy along the lines of justice, often as this affected their stewardship doctrines. And, finally, the fourth trumpet alarm started the camps to the north to march, *viz.*, Dan, Asher and Naphtali. These three tribes type the Baptist, Methodist and Unitarian Churches. The fourth trumpet alarm represents the proclamation of a controversial message, often along the lines of Divine Love as it affected their stewardship doctrines; and the three pertinent tribes marching types these three denominations entering into a controversy in defense of their stewardship doctrines and a refutation of attacks thereon. And the advance that the twelve tribes made represents the growth of these denominations in the truths implied in their stewardship doctrines. Thus their advancing in the truths of their stewardship doctrines amid controversies is typed in vs. 5 and 6.

(12) V. 7 brings out the contrast between growth in advancing Truth amid controversy and increasing in the knowledge of the Truth already had from previous unfoldings. The thought of not blowing an alarm, but of simply blowing ordinarily on the trumpet in gathering the assemblies, is emphasized by way of contrast in v. 7. In a typical way it teaches how ordinarily the Truth should be presented to the non-combative nominal people of God. We are to resort to controversy when opponents fight the Truth with error, but in the ordinary circumstances of life a controversial presentation of the Truth interferes with its acceptance. It arouses contentiousness in the hearer, and is liable to make him an opponent of the Truth, rather than its friend. If our design is to win hearers, we should avoid controversy as much as possible. If we are seeking

to repel, then controversy is to be resorted to. The positive non-combative presentation of the Truth normally is the best and most winsome method for its spread, even as shown in pp. i and ii of the Foreword to Studies, Vol. I. Controversy has its place in Christianity—to repel attacks and to attack errors during theological wars, but its place is not so much in the field of winning for the Truth. Here the non-combative method used in Vol. I is decidedly better. "You can catch more flies with sugar than with vinegar." Therefore in public and in parlor meetings, and in our conversations, when our object is to win, let us avoid blowing an alarm on our trumpet, but use it for constructive teaching. But in such public meetings, in such class meetings and in such conversations as antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter and leading the Truth section of Azazel's Goat to the Gate furnish the subject matter, the object being controversial, we will have to blow the alarm on our trumpet. Thus vs. 5, 6 show the controversial side of our work in destroying error; and v. 7 shows the upbuilding side of our work in spreading Truth.

(13) V. 8 shows whose was the privilege of sounding the trumpets. The sons of Aaron here, of course, represent the Gospel-Age Under-priesthood. The antitypical sounding was always, in each epoch of the Church, begun by its angel, and that, with the single exception of the Ephesian Church, by the principal man in the star. St. Paul, the principal man of the Ephesian Church, is the one exception. He not yet being in the Church, St. Peter was given the privilege of beginning to sound that trumpet first, which he did in opening the door of access to the Church for Jewish believers at Pentecost and for Gentile believers nearly 3½ years later. In every other case the principal man of each star led off the rest of the members of each star. This is true historically, as can be seen in the

case of John in the Smyrna Church, Arius in the Pergamos Church, Claudius of Turin in the Thyatira Church, Marsiglio in the Sardis Church, Wessel in the Philadelphia Church and Russell in the Laodicean Church. In the five churches between the two Harvest churches apparently the special helper of each member of each star followed shortly with the symbolic blowing, in support of his leader companion (these seventy, antitypical of the seventy in the Jewish Harvest, as antitypes went out two by two). Thereafter the rest of the Priesthood then functioning, according to Spirit, talents and opportunities joined in the symbolic blowing-proclaiming the message then due to the real and nominal Church.

(14) Let us illustrate by the Philadelphia star-members. John Wessel began to sound forth the Reformation message in its four main features: justification by faith, the Bible as the sole source and rule of faith, the priesthood of all the consecrated and Christ's sole headship in the Church. Thereupon he was followed by his companion and these then by others. Thereafter arose another star member, but not as a principal man—Jerome Savonarola. He in turn was followed by his companion, Fra Domenico, then by other members of the Priesthood additional to the companion, and of course not members of the star, in giving out the pertinent message. Later on Luther, as a member of this star, began to trumpet forth his part of the message—a re-emphasis of the four parts of Wessel's message; and soon Melanchthon, his assistant (two by two), joined him in it; then others of the priests joined it. On justification by faith alone, the Bible as the sole source and rule of faith, the sole priesthood of the consecrated and Christ's sole headship in the Church, these went into great detail and thus by the trumpets on the human and Divine salvation appealed to the crown-lost leaders. But whenever they appeared before the public in general, they gave generalities on

justification by faith (human salvation) and the priesthood of all the consecrated (the Divine salvation), also on the sole source and rule of faith and practice for humans and the sole headship of Jesus to the Church. So, too, like Wessel and Savonarola, their right-hand helpers and other assistants, they made couples of these four doctrines, giving only generalities to the public. A little later Zwingli appeared as a part of the Philadelphia star, joined soon by his special helper, Oecolampadius, and later by other Priests, blowing on the silver trumpet the justification and high-calling features of the Lord's Supper, in generalities to the people and particulars on one subject at a time to the crown-lost leaders. They also stressed the four general reformation truths above-mentioned, as the case might require, before the public and before the crown-lost leaders. Throughout the whole Age the Truth or truths that were due were treated in this same general way ("They shall be to you for an ordinance for the Age throughout your generations"). We have seen it witnessed in this way throughout the Parousia and the Epiphany, and believe that more illustrations for clarifying this subject are not necessary.

(15) V. 9 treats of the controversial use of these antitypical trumpets ("if ye go to war"). The Christian warfare is waged against sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, as these are led against us by Satan, the world and our flesh. Against all four of these principles in all their forms of manifestations as they are led against us by Satan, the world and the flesh, the Christian has to wage warfare. These certainly oppress ("the enemy that oppresseth") the New Creature in their multiplied forms; for many indeed are the forms of sin, many indeed are the forms of error, many indeed are the forms of selfishness and many indeed are the forms of worldliness. Every one of these forms of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness oppresses the New Creature; and against all the forms

of these four principles of evil must the New Creature fight. Our readers' familiarity with the forms of these makes it unnecessary for us here to enumerate them. These enemies oppress us in the Gospel-Age Canaan ("in your land"), which is the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, out of which we must dispossess these evils. The inhabitants of Canaan, whom Israel was to dispossess, type the various forms of these four principles of evil. Our hearts and minds are the sphere for the operation of Truth and its Spirit. So much of them as is under the sway of the New Creature corresponds to so much of Canaan as Israel wrested from the inhabitants of the land; while so much of them as is not under the sway of the New Creature corresponds to so much of Canaan as the inhabitants of the land possessed. Hence it is, as shown in Studies, Vol. V, that the hearts and minds of the Lord's people are the battle ground of the Spirit, the New Creature. And Satan, the world and the flesh are continually seeking through the inhabitants of antitypical Canaan to drive back out of this antitypical land its antitypical Israelitish inhabitants, the various forms of the Truth, of Justice, of Love, of Power, of Heavenlimindedness. These, then, are the armies involved. In command of the antitypical Israelitish armies are Jesus, the Truth and its Spirit. The issue at stake in this warfare is the antitypical land—shall it be the possession of the inhabitants of antitypical Canaan or of antitypical Israel? That will depend on who will prove conquerors in this warfare.

(16) It will be noted that the blowing of the alarm was given (v. 9) to Israel as the pledge from God of victory ("shall blow an alarm . . . shall be remembered before the Lord"). In Israel's typical battles this was the case. A good example of this is found in Israel's warfare with the Midianites (Num. 31); for Phinehas sounded the trumpets while the warriors fought (Num. 31: 6); and a wonderful victory was won.

Num. 31 types the harvest work, considered as a war against error; and Phinehas in that chapter types our Pastor. Phinehas' blowing the alarm types our Pastor throughout the reaping time proclaiming the controversial aspects of the Truth against the pertinent errors. And by these the antitypical 12,000 (the faithful brethren as they shared in the controversies of that time) completely and without loss on their part refuted the errors of the errorist (the antitypical Midianites). By our dear Pastor's pertinent activities we may also illustrate the phases of this subject as they concern the warfare against sin, selfishness and worldliness. He proclaimed the Truth against the various forms of sin, as well as exposed the evils that characterize the many forms of sin. This he did especially in his character-development articles and in his articles on cleansing from filthiness of the flesh and spirit. He certainly wrote much on these two phases of Truth against sin. And it was by the appropriating to themselves of these truths that the faithful brethren waged a good warfare against sin in their members, and helped other brethren in their battles against sin to do the same. He also proclaimed the truths against the various forms of selfishness, whereby the flesh sought to save itself from being sacrificed. These truths especially pertained to consecration, to the development of sacrificing love and the hope of victory over the flesh, as they also referred to keeping dead the human will and putting to death the human body as the warfare against the flesh. And the faithful brethren, appropriating such truths to themselves, fought by their power against the efforts of the dead will to become alive and its efforts to spare the human body the sufferings of the sacrificial death. In so far, therefore, as such truths were put and used controversially, they were the antitypical blowing of the alarm in the warfare against the flesh. And, finally, in the warfare against the world, which fought the faithful

in the family, in the state, in the nominal church, in business, in employment and in ordinary social contacts, our dear Pastor proclaimed the truths that pertained to the heavenly family, Kingdom, Church and the study, spread and practice of the Truth, as our business and employment and fellowship with the brethren, and that in contrast with the variety and transitoriness of even the best the world could give, and thus he blew the alarm on the antitypical trumpet in the warfare against the world. As the faithful brethren appropriated these truths to their development against the worldliness that was attacking them, they fought the war against the world.

(17) It will be noted that God pledged (v. 9) to remember Israel and give them victory in their wars, if the trumpet alarm was blown. So, too, God has remembered antitypical Israel in their wars who heeded the alarm sounded on the antitypical trumpet. The expression here translated, "before the Lord," may just as well be rendered, "in the face [favor] of the Lord." The word *remember* might be used either for a favorable or for an unfavorable recollection, but the words, *in the face* [favor] *of the Lord*, imply that it would be a favorable remembrance. Hence we prefer here this translation to that of the A. V. So understood we find a promise of victory given in v. 9. This promise can safely be made, because Spiritual Israel is fighting a good fight, and that for the Lord, the Truth and the brethren. Hence God naturally would regard their fighting favorably. As a result He gives the Faithful victory ("saved from your enemies"). This He does against sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, in any and every form that they assume. The fact that the 144,000 prove more than overcomers proves this. The history of the Church in the war against error is replete with examples of such victories. Especially do we see this in the Parousia and Epiphany battles against error. And to the degree of

the pertinent faithfulness will the Lord grant the commensurate degree of victory, as defeat in each fight sets in wherein unfaithfulness is manifested. This accounts for some defeats of Little Flock members, *e.g.*, Peter's compromise at Antioch, Mark's forsaking Paul and Barnabus on returning from Cyprus, the compromise of James, Paul, etc., as to the temple service, in connection with which Paul was captured, etc. This accounts for such repeated defeats of New Creatures as make them lose their crowns—Great Company brethren. Their later properly disposing themselves to the alarms of the antitypical trumpet makes them become eventual victors. The same principles are illustrated in the experiences of Youthful Worthies. And in the case of Second Deathers and fully lapsed Youthful Worthies, the alarms of the antitypical trumpet were grossly and with full willfulness disregarded in the time of their warfare, which resulted disastrously.

(18) From our preceding discussion of the two antitypical trumpets, we readily recognize that the blowing of the trumpets represents the Priesthood's proclaiming God's Word—preaching, teaching, speaking the Truth—on the human and Divine salvations, ordinary blowing representing the constructive proclamation of the Truth, alarm blowing representing the refutational and correctional proclamation of the Truth. Hence when we sing Hymn No. 24, "Blow ye the trumpet, blow the gladly solemn sound," we encourage one another to spread God's Word on the two salvations. This becomes all the more apparent when we understand the antitype of v. 10. In the type there were three kinds of occasions, apart from war, the marches and the assemblings, when, and that in connection with the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, the trumpets were to have their ordinary (not alarm) blowings: days of gladness, festivals (solemn days) and new moons. The festivals are enumerated

in Num. 28 and 29 and in Lev. 23. The new moons, of course, came monthly and only the annual seventh new moon was a festival (Num. 28: 11). The days of gladness would be any period of special national rejoicing, such as the removal of the ark (1 Chro. 15: 24; 16: 6); the dedication of the temple (2 Chro. 5: 12; 7: 6); the laying of the second temple's foundation (Ezra 3: 10); the dedication of Nehemiah's walls (Neh. 12: 35, 41); and the celebration of the renewed temple service (2 Chro. 29: 27). As we know, the burnt-offerings represent God's manifested acceptance of the sin-offerings, while the peace-offerings represent our consecration vows made and performed. During the Gospel Age God manifests His acceptance of Jesus' sin-offering by Jesus' ministering instruction, justification, sanctification (in both the humanity and the New Creature) and deliverance on our behalf.

(19) The Sabbath types our justification rest of faith, as the Millennial blessings reckoned to us by faith. The Passover of Nisan 14 represents Christ's death, our appropriating its benefits in justification and our sharing with Him in the sin-offering; while the seven days of the Passover festival represent the various, especially joyous, experiences of the Christian life during the seven epochs of the Gospel Age, its first and last days of holy convocation representing its two reaping periods. Pentecost represents for the Gospel Age our privilege in the Holy Spirit (its begettal, quickening, growth, strengthening, balancing, crystallizing and birth). The new moon day of the seventh month for the Gospel Age seems to represent our privileges as to charity, the seventh grace in St. Peter's addition problem (2 Pet. 1: 5-7) and as the seventh in logical but not written order of the twelve graces represented in the precious stones in the highpriest's breastplate and in those in New Jerusalem's walls. The day of atonement represents for the Gospel Age the sin-offering experience of the Christ, Head

and Body, not their Millennial atonement work. The festival of tabernacles (dwelling in booths) represents for the Gospel Age the various members of antitypical Israel dwelling each in his own class, the first and last days of solemn convocation representing the two reaping periods. The twelve new moons for the Gospel Age seem to represent the twelve times devoted to the experiences connected with the development, etc., of the twelve chief graces; while the observance of these seems to type the pertinent experiences in the development, etc., of these twelve graces. The days of gladness for the Gospel Age seem to represent all of our experiences, works, privileges and attainments, that give us joy in the Lord.

(20) Accordingly, these festivals, new moons and days of joy represent every feature of the Christian life in all its presuppositions, foundations, enfoldings, privileges, blessings, instruments, helps, attainments, experiences, graces, duties, providences, stages, etc. It is in connection with these that the burnt-offering of Jesus is by Him ministered to us as the manifest evidence that God has accepted His sacrifice on our behalf, as it is also in connection with these that lie offers our peace-offerings, our vows made and kept to God, as acceptable sacrifices through His merit. And the blowing of the trumpets over these two forms of sacrifice on the antitypical festivals, new moons and days of gladness, types the proclamation of the message of Truth on the antitypical burnt-offering and peace-offering in its application to the thoughts of these antitypical festivals, new moons and days of gladness. Thus on antitypical Sabbath, in connection with Jesus' ministering the manifest acceptance of His sacrifice to God and our consecration made and performed, the antitypical Priests proclaim the message of the justifying grace of God through Jesus' merit, accepted by faith in God's promise. Thus at antitypical Passover, in connection with Jesus' ministering the

pertinent privileges of the antitypical burnt-offering and peace-offering, the Priests are to proclaim the connected truths: Christ's death, justification and consecration unto death. At antitypical Pentecost, in connection with Jesus' offering the two mentioned sacrifices, the various features of the Spirit are to be proclaimed by the Priests as the message of Truth from God's Word as appropriate to the condition.

(21) At the antitypical annual seventh new moon, in connection with the same two offerings, disinterested love in its various features is to be proclaimed as the message of Truth. At the antitypical Atonement Day, in connection with the two mentioned sacrifices, the Priests are to proclaim the message of atonement through the two sin-offerings and the service of the cleansed Great Company. At the antitypical festival of Tabernacles, in connection with the same two sacrifices, the Priests are to proclaim the message of Truth on the various classes connected with the Lord's plan. On the antitypical twelve new moons, in connection with the same two sacrifices, the Priests are to proclaim the message of Truth on the twelve greatest graces, each one in its antitypical month, its period of development. And on all times of gladness, in connection with the same two sacrifices, the pertinent truths are to be the message proclaimed. Doing these things in connection always with the two antitypical sacrifices shows how Jesus' ministry and our consecration made and carried out are active throughout the Gospel Age and are to permeate all our Truth proclamations. In a word, v. 10 teaches that we are to preach the Word, only the Word, all of the Word as due, in season and out of season, pertinent to the conditions of each opportunity. The lesson is: Spread the Word! Blow ye the trumpet, blow the gladly solemn sound! Let us both sing and live Hymn No. 24!

(22) The journeyings of the twelve tribes as narrated in vs. 11-36 have relations to a number of other Scriptures.

They are related to what is stated in vs. 2, 5-9; for these verses show how the tribes were started out on their journeys and wars, as well as how they were attended in their wars by the priests' blowing alarms on their trumpets. There is even a closer connection between the journeyings of vs. 11-28 and the offerings of the Gospel-Age princes as these are recorded in Num. 7: 10-88, as can be seen from the relations of each prince and his offering to his respective tribe. And unless these two sets of Scripture are understood in their antitypical significance as to their relation to the journeying of vs. 11-36, these journeyings cannot be understood in their antitypical aspects. So, with the background of the antitypical significance of Num. 10: 2, 5-9 and 7: 10-88 as a foundation for the antitypes of vs. 11-36, the latter becomes rather easily intelligible. Accordingly, unless one understands the antitypes of the two former sets of Scripture, he will not be able to appreciate the propriety of the antitypical applications that we shall offer as those typed in vs. 11-28. But with an understanding of these, particularly those of Num. 7: 10-88, which in turn becomes more intelligible as Num. 10: 1-10 is antitypically understood, one is well prepared to understand and appreciate the antitypical applications that will be suggested in this chapter. What we have pointed out in the relations of these three Scriptures to one another is a splendid example of the principle that we have seen so often illustrated in the Parousia and the Epiphany. The Bible never gives all it teaches on any given subject in any one place, but scatters its thoughts on every subject hither and thither in the Scriptures. This is set forth very definitely in Is. 28: 10, 13, while vs. 11 and 12 show that in their witnessings on the Truth the Lord's people would illustrate the same principle.

(23) V. 11 states the date that the departure from Sinai took place: the twentieth day of the second

month of the second year since leaving Egypt. It will be recalled that this was not quite a full month after the end of their first wilderness Passover festival, which ended with the 21st day of the first month, in their second year after departing from Egypt. A comparison of v. 11 with Num. 9: 11 seemingly proves that the charge to keep the Passover festival from Nisan 15 to Nisan 21, with holy convocations marking the first and seventh days (Lev. 23: 6-8) was not given to those who, defiled on Nisan 14, were given an opportunity to keep the Passover the 14th day of the second month; since if it had, God would have made it impossible for them to keep it, by requiring them to journey on the 21st; for the first journey from Sinai, beginning on the 20th of the second month, continued into the 22nd day of that month, since it was a three days' journey (v. 33), which made them journey on the 21st, and which prevented a holy convocation being kept during that day. This seems to imply that either the added Passover festival (of 15-21 of the second month) does not type Millennial conditions, or that God chose not to type them in connection with the first annual Passover of the unclean. Very likely the former alternative is incorrect, because we know that there will be five Millennial sifting periods, and a holy convocation during the Little Season, which suggests the thought that the first phase of the Millennium, *i.e.*, the hundred years of opportunity before any of the infants of days will die (Is. 65: 20), is quite likely the holy convocation of the Millennial 15th of the second month, as the Little Season is that of the Millennial 21st of the second month. In v. 12 we understand the expression, "the wilderness of Sinai," to represent the sphere of Judaism. And out of it as borne by the antitypical Priests the antitypical Ark (v. 33) led antitypical Israel, which began its Gospel-Age journeys in the Jewish Harvest. It will be noted that it was the ark that led the whole host on this particular

journey. And since the Kohathites marched between the second and third camps (v. 21), not they, as was their ordinary charge (Num. 3: 31; 4: 15) but the priests on this occasion bore the ark, over which the cloudy, fiery pillar hovered (v. 34), even as they did on certain other special occasions (Joshua 3: 3-17; 4: 5-18; 6: 4-13; 8: 33; 1 Kings 8: 1-7). The priests' bearing the ark types the antitypical Priesthood's forwarding Jehovah's full arrangement. The ark representing God, His attributes and the Christ and His attributes, functions, etc., is an epitome of God's full arrangement. Hence the priests' bearing the ark types the antitypes' forwarding God's Plan or Word as due.

(24) From the fact that the Gospel Age touches on three one-thousand-year days and from the further fact that it was during parts of three one-thousand-year days that the antitypical journey is taken, *i.e.*, from the start of the Priests on their Gospel-Age journey, during the Jewish Harvest, until the Miller movement was entirely perverted into the Advent sect, just after 1874 (and hence it was after 1874 that the last part of the last antitypical tribe began to journey), we infer that the three days (v. 33) of the journey described in vs. 11-36 type the three one-thousand-year periods touched by the Gospel-Age; for this Gospel-Age journey began within 158 years after the fifth one-thousand-year day began, continued throughout the sixth one-thousand-year day and lasts over 80 years into the seventh one-thousand-year day. This time feature enables us to put the journeyings of all antitypical twelve tribes within the period in which facts show their journeyings were begun. In other words, this first journey of three days types the Gospel-Age antitypes for the involved story as covering the whole Gospel Age. This is not the case with all the journey types of the book of Numbers, though it is with some of them. Some of them give particularized pictures, *e.g.*, the five sifting types refer typically, each one,

from the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture, to its respective epoch of the five Church epochs between the Harvests. The incident of the twelve spies refers antitypically to the two Harvests exclusively, while the subsequent wanderings of Israel refer respectively to the large Gospel-Age wanderings and to the three miniature Gospel-Age wanderings of antitypical Israel; and the story of Num. 31 types the battles against error in the two Harvests. Other illustrations could also be adduced, but these are sufficient to illustrate the varied applications of the types of Numbers. The considerations disclosed by the fact referred to in this paragraph enable us to get the setting of the antitype as to time. Confirmation is lent to this by the fact that it was the *cloud*, not the *pillar* of fire (vs. 11, 34), that was taken up from the tabernacle at the start of the journeying, which proves that it started in one of the *days*—one of the Harvests; and the other facts above suggested prove that it was in the Jewish Harvest. This is directly stated of the typical start in vs. 11, 34. Accordingly, the time setting of the antitype is clear as beginning in the Jewish Harvest; and the fact that the marching was joined in by the last Adventist sect in the antitypical third day, combined also with the fact that the surviving members of that sect and of all others will be merged into the corresponding Epiphany sects before the Epiphany ends, proves that the end of this particular march will be reached at the end of the Gospel Age as it enters the Millennial conditions.

(25) In v. 12 the journey from one station to another is given: from Sinai (*thorny*) to the Wilderness of Paran (*cavernous*). According to v. 33 this journey was one of three days. By direct course it was about 55 miles from Horeb or Sinai to the Wilderness of Paran—a journey that could be taken in three days by fairly good travelers. We understand that the three days measure the time that it took the vanguard to make the journey. No mention is made of stops for

the night in the account of this journey. They were likely made; but as they do not figure in the antitype, the type passes over them without mention, if they were made. The word *Sinai* means *thorny*, which well describes the troublous contentious experiences of the Church while in Jewry. The word *Paran* means *abounding in foliage*, or *in caverns*. It represents the Millennial conditions as being shelterful. In a hot country like Paran, the abundance of foliage or of caverns would provide shelter from the fierce heat of the desert sun, which fact types the abundance of shelter from the heat of temptation (Matt. 13: 5, 6, 20, 21) that will be given the race during the Millennium, the third day after the Gospel-Age journey was begun. The cloud resting in Paran represents the advancing Truth progressing until it becomes the light on Millennial conditions. The statement of v. 13, that the children of Israel first took their journey according to the commandment [literally, *mouth*] of the Lord, shows that the Lord approved of those acts of the twelve denominations that antitype the starting of the Israelitish tribes on this journey. This becomes evident when we recognize what is typed by the Israelitish tribes starting on this journey. They represent the twelve denominations beginning to use their stewardship truths amid controversies against error, sin, selfishness and worldliness, which they did by using those parts of the Bible teachings in their stewardship doctrines that pertained to rebuke (refutation) and correction (2 Tim. 3: 15-17). So to progress in the Truth is certainly according to the Lord's Word (commandment, mouth). It was because of this good activity that Ps. 45: 9 speaks of these twelve denominations, the kings' daughters, as being among our Lord's honorable women, servant attendants. They are called kings' daughters because they were directly or indirectly developed from the union of church and state. The expression "by the hand of Moses," types the fact that

the going forth of these denominations in the journey antitypical of that here discussed was *by* the Son, though *of* the Father (at the Lord's mouth).

(26) It is well that we here pause for another explanation, necessary for the proper understanding of vs. 14-28. Reading the account of the order in which the four camps journeyed, one would naturally draw the conclusion that the time order of the antitypical camps' journeying is thereby given; but understanding the tribes to type the denominations as set forth in these columns, we recognize that such cannot be the thought. *E.g.*, Judah types the Calvinistic Church, while Reuben, Simeon and Ephraim type respectively the Greek Catholic, Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches. But the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches preceded the Calvinistic Church, in time by many centuries, and the Lutheran Church preceded it by several years, though Judah, the type of the Calvinistic Church, in the type set out on the march before the types of these other three Churches did. Accordingly, the time order of the antitypes is not indicated by the time order in which the four typical camps started out on their journey. This holds true only as between the four camps, but in each tribe of each camp the time order is also that of the antitypical tribes. To this rule Unitario-Universalism (Naphtali) is not a real exception, for while the Unitarian feature of it was developed before Methodism (Asher), the Universalistic feature of it was developed after Methodism was developed, and it is to present the matter from the standpoint of the finished picture that antitypical Naphtali is represented as coming last and after antitypical Asher. But if the time order of the antitypes is not given in the time order of the marching of the four typical camps, then what order is here given? We answer: the logical order of power, wisdom, justice and love. It will be recalled that we pointed out that the camp of Judah, embracing the three tribes to the east

of the tabernacle, had on its standard the figure of a lion, which we know represents power, prefiguring that the central thought in the stewardship doctrines of the camp of antitypical Judah would be power; that the standard of the camp of Reuben, embracing the three tribes to the south of the tabernacle, had on its standard the figure of an eagle, which we know represents wisdom, prefiguring that the central thought in the stewardship doctrines of the camp of antitypical Reuben would be wisdom; that the standard of the camp of Ephraim, embracing the three tribes to the west of the tabernacle, had on its standard the figure of an ox, which we know represents justice (from the fact that a bullock was used to represent our Lord's humanity as the satisfaction of Divine justice), prefiguring that the central thought in the stewardship doctrines of the camp of antitypical Ephraim would be justice; and that the camp of Dan, embracing the three tribes to the north of the tabernacle, had on its standard the figure of a man's face, which, having in the normal man a lovelit expression, we know represents love, prefiguring that the central thought in the stewardship doctrines of the camp of antitypical Dan would be love.

(27) As we recognize that these four camps typed in their standards the four great attributes of God, we are prepared to see how in the order of their journeyings these four camps type the thought, or logical, as distinct from the time order, in the journeyings of the antitypical four camps. A closer view of the antitype will show this. Judah represents the Calvinistic Church, whose stewardship doctrine is the Lord's Supper as representing Christ's death, faith-appropriating justification and the fellowship of the faithful in suffering. What is the thought central to this doctrine? Is it not Christ crucified, the *power* of God unto justification and sanctification (1 Cor. 1: 23, 25)? Yea, verily. Issachar represents the Campbellite Church, whose

stewardship doctrine is: The Bible as the Christian's creed is the center of unity for God's people. But what is God's Word if not power, even as it is written: "The Word of God is quick [energetic] and powerful, etc." (Heb. 4: 12). Zebulun types the Adventists, whose stewardship doctrine is: Chronology points out the time of the Kingdom, which will overthrow evil and enthrone righteousness. But the central thought of the time-designated-all-conquering Kingdom is that of power (2 Pet. 1: 16). Thus we see that power is the central thought in the stewardship doctrines of the antitypical camp to the antitypical east of the tabernacle. An examination of the antitypical camp to the antitypical south of the tabernacle will show that the central thought of the stewardship doctrines of the three denominations in that camp is wisdom. Reuben types the Greek Catholic Church, whose stewardship doctrine is: Christ in His pre-human, human and post-human conditions is God's Special Representative, the Agent of all His plans and purposes. But Christ in these very particulars is God's wisdom in carrying out God's purposes (1 Cor. 1: 23, 24; Col. 2: 3). Simeon types the Roman Catholic Church, whose stewardship doctrine is: The one Church is the depository and administrator of the Truth and its Spirit. The Church in this particular is the Divinely appointed guardian and agent of the Truth, which is God's wisdom (1 Cor. 2: 6-8). Gad types the Anglican or Episcopal Church, whose stewardship doctrine is: While in the flesh Jesus and the Church are subject to the civil powers, and not *vice versa.* But what is this other than a feature of the mystery hidden from ages and generations, which is Christ in you, first revealed to suffer at the hands of the world (Col. 1: 27)? Thus the thought central to the three stewardship doctrines of this antitypical camp is the hidden wisdom of God, lodging in the Christ, Head and Body.

(28) Ephraim types the Lutheran Church, whose

stewardship doctrine is Justification by faith, wherein is revealed the righteousness (justice) of God in justifying the believing sinner (Rom. 3: 20-26). Manasseh types the Congregational Church, whose stewardship doctrine is: Christians as brethren are all equal before the bar of Divine justice, and therefore have equal rights with one another in Church polity. Here, again, is the idea of justice, not only Godward, but also manward, as expressed in the golden rule (Matt. 22: 35-40). Benjamin types the fanatical sects, which had their start in Quakerism, all of which have as their stewardship doctrine the thought: True religion is supreme love for God and equal love for the neighbor (Matt. 22: 35-40). This, too, centers in justice. Accordingly, we see that the thought central to the stewardship doctrines of the antitypical camp to the antitypical east of the tabernacle is justice. Dan types the Baptist Church, whose stewardship doctrine is: Only the truly justified and consecrated are God's real people. But the heart of consecration is love (Col. 3: 14; 1 Cor. 13: 1-3; 1 Tim. 1: 5). Asher types the Methodist Church, whose stewardship doctrine is: The Divine love is God's ideal for His people (1 John 3: 16; 4: 7, 12, 16, 21; 5: 2, 3). Naphtali types the Unitario-Universalist Church, whose stewardship doctrine is: There is but one God, whose highest attribute is love (John 17: 3; 1 Cor. 8: 6; 1 Tim. 2: 5; 1 John 4: 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17). Accordingly, we see that in the camp of antitypical Dan the three stewardship doctrines of its three respective denominations have as their central thought that of love. Our examination, accordingly, proves that the time order of the going forth of the antitypical four camps is not represented by the time order of the going forth of their respective typical camps. It rather proves that the logical or thought order in their relation to the four great Divine attributes is the thing of order observed in the order of the antitypical camps' going forward in the journeyings. But our examination does

prove that in each camp the antitypical three tribes went forth in the time order of the typical tribes of the respective typical camps. And for the reason above given, that of the completed going forth of antitypical Naphtali (Unitario-Universalism) is no exception to this rule, when viewed from the standpoint of its time of journeying, compared with that of the Methodist Church as antitypical Asher, whose type in birth is later than Naphtali.

(29) V. 14 specifically states that the standard of Judah journeyed first. This types the fact that God's power as it appears in the three doctrines: (1) The Christ Class crucified, represented in the Lord's Supper; (2) The Bible as the Christian's only creed, the center of Christian unity; and (3) The chronology pointing out the Kingdom as the over thrower of evil and establisher of good, logically comes first in the Christian warfare. And without any doubt, the Cross, the Word and the chronologically designated Kingdom, working in power, logically come first in Christianity. And in the logical order of development, as well as in the time order of their development, these three doctrines follow one another in the demonstration of power in the time order in which they were made the stewardship doctrines of their respective denominations. The first of these is the Christ, Head and Body, crucified, as pictured in the Lord's Supper. It comes in logical order first of all Christian doctrines and in time order was properly made the first of the three stewardship doctrines of the antitypical camp to the east. Our study of the offerings of the Gospel-Age Princes (Num. 7: 10-89) and of the priests' blowing the trumpets with alarms for the camps' marching (Num. 10: 5-8) enables us to see the time relations between such offerings and blowings and the tribal journeyings. In explaining the tribal journeyings we will in each case point out these three separate sets of acts, which will enable us to have a full view of the antitype in its three

salient features as they developed during the Gospel Age. We begin with typical and antitypical Judah. As we have seen, the tribe of Judah (*praised*) types the Calvinistic Church, which in non-English-language nations is called the Reformed Church and in English language nations the Presbyterian Church. It was Zwingli who in 1521 began to blow forth the silver trumpets, *i.e.*, proclaim the message that the Lord's Supper represents (1) the death of Jesus, (2) faith appropriating justification from the merit of His humanity and life laid down unto death, and (3) the fellowship of the consecrated in suffering (though he did not understand this as implying the Church's share in the sin-offering, which it actually does). His proclaiming this message quickly brought to his side Oecolampadius as his special companion helper and others who joined him in the proclamation, and this resulted in a widespread Little Flock movement having the pertinent doctrine as its keynote. For a number of years this movement remained a Little Flock movement.

(30) But presently, under the lead of John Calvin a sectarianizing of this movement began about 1538. To him a number of other able men, like Beza, Bullinger, Farel and Knox joined themselves and before many years turned the Little Flock movement started by Zwingli into the denomination called the Reformed or the Presbyterian Church. For details please see Chapter IV. The work of these crown-lost leaders resulted in gathering about them an aggressive denomination, which, next to the Lutheran Church, is the largest of the Protestant denominations. It is at this point, *i.e.*, starting the sectarianizing of this Little Flock movement, resulting in a large sectarian following gathering about these leaders, attracted by these leaders' offering their antitypical bowl, charger and spoon, that the antitype of the journeying of the children of Judah set in (v. 14). Thus the crown-lost leaders led the vanguard of antitypical Judah. Judah's journeying under

the leadership of Nahshon (*subtle*), the son of Amminadab (*my people is willful*), types the members of the Calvinistic Church, under the direction of the above-mentioned crown-losers, starting to engage in controversy on the Lord's Supper, both from a refutational and a correctional standpoint, though less markedly they presented this teaching from a doctrinal and ethical standpoint. They controversially defended their doctrine of the Lord's Supper against the Romanists' attacks on it, from the standpoint of transubstantiation, and against the Lutherans' attacks on it, from the standpoint of instrumentalization. And they vindicated the representative and commemorative view of it. Not only did they thus refute the attacks coming from the defenders of the two above-mentioned errors, but they attacked these errors with telling effect, which demonstrated their erroneousness. In waging a defensive and aggressive warfare against these two errors, they made good use of the Bible as profitable for reproof, refutation (2 Tim. 3: 16). But they used their doctrine of the Lord's Supper also correctively (2 Tim. 3: 16), to cleanse themselves thereby from sin, for which this doctrine, as inciting to self-examination and purging out the old leaven, very nicely lent itself. They, of course, used the doctrine also constructively, *i.e.*, to inculcate an understanding of its various phases (doctrine) and to develop a pertinent character (instruction in righteousness). All four of these features, but more particularly the first and second above mentioned, are typed by their journeying. The armed men of Judah going forth on this journeying at the sound of the alarm more particularly represent the controversial aspects of the case as to error and sin, while the other Judahites represent more particularly their teaching as to the constructive features, in indoctrination and ethical conduct. Yet all of them, generally speaking, in their journeying picture all four aspects of these uses of God's Word on the Lord's Supper.

In this activity they vindicated God's power as working in both salvations, as symbolized by the three features of the Lord's Supper.

(31) The second tribe of the camp of Judah was Issachar (*hire*), whose leader was Nethaneel (*gift of God*), the son of Zuar (*little*, *humble*). The Little Flock leader who began the Little Flock movement which was later sectarianized into the Campbellite Church was Barton Stone, who in 1804, in Tenn. and Ky., began to preach the doctrine that the Bible alone as the creed of God's people is the center of their unity. In 1809 Thomas Campbell, the father of Alexander Campbell, in southwestern Pennsylvania began a similar movement and thus became the second of the two of whom Barton Stone, as the star-member of the two, was the first. These were soon joined by other Priests, all blowing on the two trumpets as related to the teaching that the Bible as the Christian's sole creed is the center of unity for God's people. As a result a lively Little Flock movement was set into operation by these Priests, under the lead of Barton Stone and Thomas Campbell. Presently Alexander Campbell joined this movement and began to sectarianize it. In such sectarianizing work he was joined by Samuel Rogers, John Smith, Thomas Allen, Walter Scott, Isaac Errett, etc. As an outcome of their efforts the Campbellite, or Christian, or Disciple denomination arose. For details please see Chapter IV. It was at this point of their sectarianizing this movement, that antitypical Issachar (the Campbellite Church, the crown-lost leaders being in the vanguard) started out on his Gospel-Age journey. It was the Priests' blowing of the antitypical alarm on the doctrine that became the Campbellites' stewardship doctrine that started their crown-lost leaders out as the vanguard of antitypical Issachar; and they started the march by offering their antitypical bowl, charger and spoon (v. 15). Soon they were joined by sectarian followers who were not consecrated.

The non-leaders of typical Issachar beginning their journeying represent these Campbellites entering controversially into a progressive growth in the knowledge of this denomination's stewardship doctrine refutatively against the opposing teachings of others, and using it to cleanse themselves and others from the sectarian evils against which that stewardship doctrine was a protest, as well as advancing constructively in the knowledge of this doctrine and in heart qualities in harmony therewith. So doing they made a proper use as unbegotten people of their stewardship doctrine. By such a course they shook the confidence of many in the sectarian creeds and advanced the idea of true Christian unity, despite their sectarian denial of it in act. By the foregoing course they advanced power as an attribute of God, working by the Bible in its relation to unity among God's people.

(32) The third tribe in the camp of Judah was Zebulun (*habitation*), whose prince was Eliab (*my God is father*), the son of Helon (*strong*). This tribe types the sect called the Adventists. The Little Flock member who began the movement that was later sectarianized into the Advent Church was William Miller, who in 1829 began to advance the thought of the chronology as proving the nearness of Christ's Second Advent and the Kingdom of God for the overthrow of evil and the establishment of righteousness. This doctrine likewise emphasized the idea of Divine power, centering it in the object of Christ's Second Advent and Kingdom. Thus William Miller blew the alarm on his symbolic trumpet, and continued to do so for about 20 years. He was constantly involved in controversy with the post-Millennialists and this proves the alarm character of his blowing, though, of course, he also on proper occasions sounded the non-alarm, the constructive teachings, doctrinally and ethically, of this doctrine. Bro. Miller's special Little Flock companion was Bro. Wolf, these two constituting the two companions sent

forth, Bro. Miller the star-member of the two and Bro. Wolf his non-star special helper. Other Priests joined these in sending forth the message on chronology designating Christ's Second Advent and Kingdom, which resulted in the development of a very vigorous Little Flock movement. But presently crown-lost leaders, Joshua Hines, James and Ellen White, Uriah Smith, Miles Grant, etc., associating themselves with these, began after the 1844 disappointment a sectarianizing movement, which culminated in the Adventist Church. For details please see Chapter IV. These crown-lost leaders were antitypical Eliab. In the antitype their sectarian emphasis on the chronology as pointing out the nearness of the Second Advent and Kingdom given in their antitypical bowl, charger and spoon started off antitypical Zebulun on his march (v. 16). In this sectarian emphasis they stressed the bowl, charger and spoon use of the doctrine that became the stewardship teaching of the Adventist Church. So doing, they started out as the vanguard of antitypical Zebulun. Those unbegotten persons who, attracted by these crown-lost leaders, joined their sect and began to use this stewardship teaching controversially, correctionally, doctrinally and ethically, progressing in these four respects especially amid controversy, formed the rest of antitypical Zebulun and by such activities started out in the journeying of antitypical Zebulun. In standing for this doctrine refutatively, correctively, doctrinally and ethically, they advanced and vindicated God's power as it is associated with the chronologically-indicated Kingdom.

(33) V. 17 shows that the Gershonites and Merarites journeyed between the camp of Judah and the camp of Reuben. This is not accidental, but Divinely designed. This can be recognized when we consider, on the one hand, that the camps between which they traveled typed—that of Judah, Divine power operating, and that of Reuben, Divine wisdom operating, and, on

the other hand, that the work of the Gershonites typed the faith-justified bringing sinners to justification and justified ones to consecration, and that the work of the Merarites typed the work of editors, publishers, etc., preparing for the press, printing and circulating Bibles, books, magazines and tracts on the Bible, and of colporteurs and justified bookstore owners and clerks handling Biblical literature, justified scribes and printers of religious literature being reckoned among the antitypical Merarites; for we have seen, Chapter III, that such were the works of these two sets of justified workers. Accordingly, the evangelistic efforts of the justified, both by word of mouth and by writing pertinent literature, as well as the support of such in this work by justified believers, are the antitype of the Libnite Gershonites' carrying their part of the tabernacle; and the efforts of justified believers to induce justified ones to consecrate are the antitypes of the Shimite Gershonites' bearing their part of the tabernacle. But in so doing they stood for the justification and consecration features of the Gospel; and as their serving the justification features made them emphasize the main surface things of the human salvation centering in Jesus, they of necessity emphasized Him crucified, the power and wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1: 23, 24). So, in typing this fact, the Libnite Gershonites traveled in their logical place by journeying between the camps of Judah and Reuben. In the Shimite Gershonites' stressing consecration and thus seeking to help justified ones to consecration, they emphasized the surface features of the high calling, and thus completed their part in preaching *the* Christ crucified as, unconsciously to them, the Church sharing with our Lord in crucifixion; and thus they presented these as being, with Jesus, the Christ crucified, the power and wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1: 23, 24). Accordingly, in typing this the Shimite Gershonites traveled in their logical place by journeying between the camps of Judah and Reuben.

(34) On further study we will also recognize the propriety of the Merarites' journeying between these two camps. The antitypical Merarites were the literary agents to establish the literary contacts of the antitypical Gershonites and Kohathites with the people, the Levites and the Priests. They, of course, did not minister through the oral services of the Gershonites (preaching and teaching by word of mouth) and Kohathites (lecturing and teaching by word of mouth). Rather, their service was to put the pen products of the antitypical Gershonites on repentance, faith, justification and consecration, and of the antitypical Kohathites on the linguistical, exegetical, historical and systematic Bible helps, into print and circulate them among the antitypical camp, Levites and Priests. From what was shown in the preceding paragraph on how the Gershonites journeyed in their logical place between the camps of Judah and Reuben for typical purposes, it follows that whatever the antitypical Merarites did for the help of the antitypical Gershonites in their work by putting their pen products into print and by circulating them furthered the Lord's matters along the line of His power and wisdom. And whatever they did that furthered the antitypical Kohathites for their literary products in ministering to Divine wisdom and power was, of course, on their part a ministering to Divine wisdom and power. Thus we see that both the typical Gershonites and typical Merarites were put in their logical place for the antitype when they were required to journey between the camps of Judah and Reuben. The taking down (v. 17) of their parts of the tabernacle by the Gershonites seems to type the preparatory work that the antitypical Gershonites would make for the furthering of their progress in knowledge, grace and service, as related to the pertinent antitypical journey, *e.g.*, the antitypical Libnites in preparing their evangelistic campaigns, pertinent sermons and writings, the antitypical Shimites in preparing their

campaigns, pertinent sermons and writings for leading justified ones to consecration, the antitypical Mahlite Merarites in preparing their materials, plans, etc., for editing Bibles and other religious books, magazines and tracts, and the antitypical Mushite Merarites in preparing for the printing and circulation of Bibles and other religious books, magazines and tracts. These two groups of Levites' bearing the tabernacle (v. 17) types the respective services of the antitypical Gershonites in furthering justificational and consecrational work and of the antitypical Merarites in editing, publishing and circulating the Bible and other Christian literature. The Gershonites' and Merarites' setting forth (v. 17) types their antitypes' beginning such services. The formers' progress, the latters' progress and the formers' arrival at Paran, the latters' coming to the kingdom's conditions in the Epiphany Levites.

(35) V. 18 introduces the journeying of the second camp, that of Reuben (*behold a son*). As already shown, the standard of this camp had an eagle embroidered on it. We have already shown that this figure types the Divine wisdom; and we have already shown how wisdom is the central thought in the stewardship doctrines of the three denominations typed by the three tribes in the camp to the south of the tabernacle. According to Num. 2: 2, in addition to each camp having one standard, which did not serve as the ensign of the tribe at the head of the pertinent camp, each of the twelve tribes had an ensign. It is these twelve ensigns that stood for the twelve tribes, as did the twelve precious stones in the high priest's breastplate; and they typed the same as these twelve stones—the twelve chief graces of the Christian character, corresponding to the twelve precious stones in the foundations of New Jerusalem's walls (Rev. 21: 19-21) and the twelve fruits of the tree of life (Rev. 22: 2). Accordingly, Reuben was the first tribe of the camp to the south of the tabernacle, and as such typed

the Greek Catholic Church, whose stewardship doctrine was: Christ was God's special representative in all His creative, revelatory and providential works in His prehuman condition, and in all His redemptive works in His human condition, and as such in His instructional, justifying, sanctifying and delivering works toward the Church and the world, and in vicegerental works in His post-human nature throughout the universe forever; for this undoubtedly was the stewardship doctrine of the Greek Catholic Church.

(36) The Little Flock member who started the Little Flock movement on Christ's pre-human, human and post-human office was the Apostle John, who presented this doctrine in opposition to Gnosticism of the type sponsored by Cerinthus. According to Polycarp, John, accidentally meeting Cerinthus in one of the public baths, ran quickly out of the building, lest it fall upon the heretic. St. John in his Gospel, Epistles and Apocalypse treats of the pre-human, human and posthuman office of Christ, his pertinent thoughts being that the Logos, God's only begotten, was His agent in creation, revelation and providence before He became human, became human to be God's agent in redemption and became Divine in His resurrection to act as God's agent in instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance for the Church and the world and in vicegerental rulership throughout the universe. Being an Apostle, though also a member of the Smyrna star, St. John did not have a special helper companion (not being one of the antitypical 70 between the Harvests), as the other star members between the two Harvests did. But Polycarp, who died either 155 or 166 A. D., as the first one of the 70 between the two Harvests and as the star-member of the first two of these 70, the other being Polycrates of Ephesus, joined after John's death in sounding out this message, as well as that of the proper Paschal date. Other priestly brethren took up this message of Christ's office, proclaiming it. Thus

the sons of antitypical Aaron (v. 8), as typed, blew out this message on their symbolic trumpets. Thus a Little Flock movement advanced along the line of this doctrine. Next the crown-lost leaders appeared on the scene, who, while they woefully perverted the teaching of Christ's pre-human, human and post-human person by trinitarianism and God-manism, nevertheless held to the teaching of His pre-human, human and post-human office work as being that of God's special representative in creation, revelation, providence, redemption, instruction, justification, sanctification, deliverance and universe-rulership. Such crown-lost leaders began to offer as follows: Origen (225 A. D.), Dionesius of Rome (260 A. D.), Athanasius (320 A. D.), Basil (350 A. D.), Gregory of Nazianzen (370 A. D.) and Gregory of Nyssa (380 A. D.). Their work resulted in perverting the Little Flock movement that John started into a sect, the Greek Catholic Church. Their offering their bowl, charger and spoon started antitypical Reuben's journeying in his prince. They attracted great numbers to themselves as members of antitypical Reuben who joined in the journeying of this antitypical tribe by entering heartily into the so-called Christological controversies and applied the stewardship teaching of the Greek Catholic Church doctrinally, refutatively, correctively and ethically. Thus they waged an aggressive and defensive warfare for this teaching, as well as spread it constructively in doctrinal and ethical respects, and thereby they advanced various features of Divine wisdom. And in so doing they marched after their leaders—antitypical Elizur (*my God is a rock*), the son of Shedeur (*lightspreader*). This resulted in their advancing and vindicating God's Wisdom. Details will be found on this matter in Chapter V.

(37) V. 19 brings to our attention the journeying of the tribe of Simeon (*student*), which was the second tribe of the second camp, that of Reuben. The prince

of Simeon was Shelumiel (*peace of God*), the son of Zurishaddai (*my rock is almighty*). As set forth in Chapter V, we understand the tribe of Simeon to type the Roman Catholic Church. Like all other antitypical tribes, antitypical Simeon's journeying was preceded by the priesthood's blowing an alarm (v. 8) on its symbolic trumpets. The Little Flock member who started to blow this alarm was Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp. His sounding this alarm was occasioned by Gnosticism, both within and without the Church seeking to destroy the Truth and the Church by sectarianizing both out of existence. To their claim for their new doctrine to be the teaching of the Church, he opposed the thoughts that only that which was universally believed among Christians from the times of the Apostles could be the Truth, and only that could be the Church which held this faith immaculate everywhere since the days of the Apostles. This teaching, stated then, at a time so near the days of the Apostles, was undoubtedly true; it could not now be made in truth because in the long centuries intervening the true faith was largely lost by everybody; and in its place many corruptions have been accepted by all Christians up to well within the Gospel Harvest. Hence this clincher of the Truth in Irenaeus' day would be a fallacy now. From these conditions Irenaeus set forth the following truth: The one Church of God is the one custodian and administrator of the saving Truth. This was the message that, as an alarm, he blew out. Tertullian of Carthage, Africa, became his special helper companion, as the non-star-member of the two of whom Irenaeus was the star-member. To these a number of Priests rallied, all of whom blew the alarm on the trumpets; and as an accompaniment these constituted and aroused a considerable Little Flock movement, whose watchword was, There is but one Church of God, which is the custodian and administrator of the Truth. Presently crown-lost brethren, beginning about

251 A. D. with Cyprian, of Carthage, Africa, a disciple of Tertullian, perverted this movement into a sect. The chief other promoters of this sectarian movement were most of the successive popes of Rome, beginning with Cornelius (251) and culminating in Gregory the Great (590), Damasus (360), Innocent (402) and Leo the Great (440) being the chief ones between these two. But still more influential were Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome, who, with Gregory the Great, constitute the four Roman Catholic Church Fathers, in sectarianizing the Romanist Church. Chief among all these were Cyprian and Augustine, the latter more than the former, in perverting the Little Flock movement on the one Church being the custodian and administrator of the Truth. As these crown-lost leaders offered their bowl, charger and spoon, they antityped Shelumiel, the son of Zurishaddai, starting out on the journeying of v. 19. To these an ever increasing number of followers attached themselves as members of the Roman Catholic Church, who, controverting on this subject grew in knowledge, grace and service on it as they discussed the subject doctrinally, refutatively, correctionally and ethically; and in so doing they performed their part in the journeying of v. 19. This whole sectarian aggregation made the mistake of holding that the Roman Catholic Church is the one true Church. Details on this subject will be found in Chapter V. In standing for this teaching antitypical Simeon advanced and vindicated Divine wisdom in relation to this doctrine.

(38) v. 20 treats of Gad's part in the journeying, the tribe of Gad being the third tribe in the camp of Reuben, whose station was to the tabernacle's south, his prince being Eliasaph, the son of Deuel. Gad means *company*; Eliasaph, my *God adds*; and Deuel, *recognition of power*. Gad types the Episcopal, or Anglican Church; Eliasaph, its crown-lost leaders, Elizabeth, Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Hooker, Taylor, Barrow, Laud, etc. The Little Flock member who began

the movement later perverted into the Episcopal Church was Thomas Cranmer, about 1533, who in a controversy with the pope blew on his trumpets the alarm, Jesus and the Church, while in the flesh, in secular matters were by God made subject to the civil powers. This Biblical principle gives the state no power over the Christ in His spiritual rights, duties and possessions, nor authority to rule the Church as a body, but it does subject its members in their persons in secular matters to the civil powers. Cranmer was soon joined in this movement by Latimer, his helper companion, the non-star-member of the two of whom Cranmer was the star-member. Other Priests joined in this trumpet-alarm blowing and a vigorous Little Flock movement set in, which was in part sectarianized by its Little Flock leaders, under a mistaken view of the power of the king to direct religious, ecclesiastical affairs; for they taught that he was, under God, the head of the Anglican Church. But the real sectarianizing of this movement was in its beginning directed by Elizabeth, Cecil and Parker, in their pertinent agitations and works. Then, later, other crown-lost leaders joined in this sectarianizing work. All of such crown-lost leaders by offering their bowl, charger and spoon, started to journey, in antitype of Eliasaph, the son of Deuel, starting to march (v. 20). Details on this subject may be found in Chapter V. These were joined in by a large following gathered into the Episcopal Church as members. As these entered sectarianly into the pertinent controversy, they antityped the tribe of Gad setting out on its journey as stated in v. 20. Gad's progress in this journey typed their growth in knowledge, grace and service, by a defensive and aggressive controversy on the stewardship doctrine of the Episcopal Church, *i.e.*, in secular matters Jesus and the Church are as individuals subject to the powers that be. And by their using this doctrine correctionally and ethically, they continued to progress in knowledge,

grace and service along the line of their stewardship doctrine. As they so did, they advanced and vindicated the Divine wisdom in subjecting Jesus and the Church as individuals to the powers that be, for thereby the Divine wisdom manifested itself in the development of the Christ amid sufferings, which in a large measure came upon them through their sufferings caused by the state of persecution, etc. The foregoing discussion on the three tribes to the tabernacle's south (Reuben, Simeon and Gad) demonstrates how in the antitype the three involved stewardship doctrines centered in the Christ class as the manifest expression of God's wisdom working in His plan.

(39) In continuing our study of Num. 10: 11-36, it would be well to remember that the three days' march there described types the Gospel-Age progress of the Real and Nominal Church from their coming out from Judaism until the Kingdom. In that march the antitypical Priests, bearing the antitypical Ark, led the march (v. 33). The next to join, considered logically and not chronologically, were the crown-lost leaders of antitypical Judah, then antitypical Judah as the followers. These in turn were followed by the crown-lost leaders of antitypical Issachar, then by their ledlings. Next came the crown-lost leaders of antitypical Zebulun, followed in turn by its ledlings, etc., etc., as one camp after another joined in the antitypical march in its logical order and divisions. In every case of a camp's marching the antitypical Priests blew the alarm on their trumpets for the antitypical camps to start (vs. 5, 6). Viewed from the chronological standpoint, we know that each antitypical tribe started out after the pertinent Priestly movement was begun; for in its crown-lost leaders it started out as they began to offer their antitypical bowl, charger and spoon. Thereupon in each case the pertinent denomination set forth on its antitypical journey. Hence the march of Num. 10: 11-36 is a very remarkable type, whose study

should be both informing and refreshing. We are in the antitype now nearly at the end of the Gospel-Age march. Soon the last Priests will have successfully carried the antitypical Ark to the resting place (v. 33) that it will have searched out for the Priests, the Levites and the people. The end of the Epiphany will end the Priestly part of the journey; shortly thereafter will the Great Company and Youthful Worthy Levites finish their journey; and shortly thereafter the antitypical twelve tribes will do the same. It will be noted that the Gospel Age being accompanied by the miniature Gospel Age at its end, the tribal picture of the Gospel Age is transferred to the Little Gospel-Age tribes, the larger tribes passing away during Armageddon and their place in the picture being taken until the finished picture by the little tribes of the miniature Gospel Age. The merging of the large tribes into the smaller ones is not shown in this type, perhaps because the survivors of the large tribes will become the small tribes in the transition time. It is necessary to keep this thought in mind in order to harmonize with the picture the facts of the fulfillment during the time from Armageddon onward.

(40) In paragraph (38) we finished the section under study up to and including v. 20. V. 21 describes the Kohathites' part in the march. It will be noted that they marched in the middle of the host—six tribes marching ahead of them and six tribes marching behind them; or, to put it into another form, two camps marched ahead of them and two behind them. This position was not at all accidental. Rather it was specifically designed. This will appear from the following: The Kohathites' service was the carrying of the covered furniture and vessels of the sanctuary, and this gave to them the most sacred service that Levites could perform; and to give the intended helps to the priests, tribal leaders, other Levites and the people, it was fitting that they occupy the center of the host.

Again, the tabernacle was to be ready for the placing of the furniture and vessels therein by the time the Kohathites arrived at the newly erected tabernacle ("against [the time] they came"—v. 21). This required them to march separately and later than the Merarites and Gershonites, who had the work of erecting the tabernacle and court, as the account shows, (vs. 17, 21). Thus there was a reason for the marching position of the Kohathites from the standpoint of the Levites. There was also a reason for it from the standpoint of the Priests; for the Priests were the chief leaders of the whole host, which was indicated by their marching on this journey ahead of the host, and the tribal heads were the secondary leaders, each marching at the head of his tribe, and the tertiary group leaders, the Kohathites, had to be placed in a relation to the host to show their tertiary position—hence the center of the host was selected for this, where, accordingly, they marched. Then, too, their relations to the Israelites as such required that, as they bore the most sacred things of the sanctuary, from which the people got the most good, they should be placed in their very midst. Accordingly, the typical Kohathites were rightly situated in the host's march.

(41) When we look at the antitype, the position of the antitypical Kohathites is in its logical place; for their work is the most responsible of all Levitical work. It will be recalled that the antitypical Kohathites' work is to provide the learned lectures and books on religious, linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic subjects. Thereby they furnish matter helpful for the furthering of the Christ as the antitypical Brazen and Golden Altars, as the antitypical Lampstand and Table and as part of the antitypical Ark, and of God's attributes as the rest of it, and helpful for furthering the Bible as the antitypical Laver. Moreover such linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic helps further for the Priests the antitypical

vessels as doctrines, refutations, corrections and instructions in righteousness. In doing this work they help not only the Priests, but also the crown-lost leaders, their Levite brethren and the antitypical camp. Thus the typical Kohathites' being in the center of the camp types that the antitypical Kohathites would minister to all logically traveling before and all logically traveling after them in the antitypical march. In Chapter II we described the work of the Gospel-Age Kohathites. It was in the doing of the work there described that they did the work typed by the Kohathites' marching as described in v. 21. The Gershonites' work on the tabernacle in its erecting against the time of the Kohathites' arrival with the covered sacred furniture and vessels, types that the work of the antitypical Gershonites—justificational and consecrational—logically precedes the learned work of the antitypical Kohathites to help such justified and consecrated ones. The Merarites' work on the tabernacle in its erecting against the time of the Kohathites' arrival with the covered sacred furniture and vessels, types (1) that the publishers and editors of Gershonite writings on justification and sanctification work together with the antitypical Gershonites to bring people to justification and consecration and (2) that through previous antitypical Merarites' work of editing, printing and publishing Bibles and other religious books, magazines and tracts, helps for further advances would be made in Kohathite knowledge given orally or in print, as the case might be.

(42) *E.g.*, the prior printed Hebrew and Greek recensions of the Bible furnished to later antitypical Gershonite Amramite Kohathites helps that enabled them to issue still more improved recensions. Thus Griesbach's Greek Testament, whose text is used by the Diaglott, helped Lachmann to get out his Greek recension. And this in turn assisted Tischendorf in making a number of improvements on Lachmann's

recension. And in turn Westcott and Hort were by Tischendorf enabled to progress further than the latter; and, finally, by the help furnished by Westcott and Hort's recension, and as a basis for his work, Mr. Panin has been able to publish his long promised Numeric Greek Testament, which in the changes not based on his use of neighborhood numerics should give us the correct readings of the New Testament in Greek. How extensively his emendations are based on neighborhood numerics, which God placed in the Bible as a warning against errors that some would regard as correct, we do not know, so will have to wait until he has published his large Introduction to his Numeric Greek Testament, where, we understand, he purposes to show the process through which each reading of Westcott and Hort's recension has been corrected or justified. By using neighborhood numerics to stand as a proof of a reading, Mr. Panin has misplaced the comma in Luke 23: 43. Thus we see that each succeeding recensionist stood on the shoulders of his predecessor. The same course appears in the work of the successive Kohathite Greek and Hebrew lexicographers, grammarians, translators, concordance-makers, introductionists, exegetes, harmoneticians, historians, biographers, archeologists, chronologians, geographers, dogmaticians, apologists and ethicians. In other words, as the Priestly Truth advanced, each succeeding part of the seven angels advanced on the basis laid down by his predecessor; and similarly, in giving to these, the crown-lost princes, their Levite brethren and the antitypical camp, Kohathite helps related to such advancing Truth, the antitypical Kohathites advanced on their predecessors. And in order to type that the antitypical Merarites would make preparations for such advance work by editing, printing and circulating previously their predecessors' work, the typical Merarites erected their parts of the tabernacle before the Kohathites arrived there.

(43) So far as the antitypical Priests have been concerned, the logical position of the antitypical Kohathites has been one in which they could help them. This is typed by the Kohathites' being in the center of the host, reaching forward and backward. By that antitypical position they offered the Priests the various helps that the above-indicated activities of the antitypical Kohathites put in their way; and thus they bore the antitypical furniture and vessels for the Priests covered. In a similar way they ministered to the crown-lost leaders, who in their individuals until 1917 were by God from another standpoint looked upon as Priests, since until 1917 there was no Great Company, though all through the Age from shortly after Pentecost there have been crown-losers. Generally speaking, the helps that the antitypical Kohathites have been giving to the antitypical Israelites as distinct from Priests and Levites have, of course, not been of the deeply scholarly kind. Rather they have been of the popular kind, simplified matters, generalities of scholarship rather than its particularities, such as general translations, less learned concordances, like Cruden's, Walker's, Hazard's and Englishman's, and simple introductory, exegetical, harmonetic, historical, apologetical, doctrinal, ethical, archeological, chronological and geographic matters, such, *e.g.*, as is found in certain special editions of the Bible, like the Oxford, Baxter, Holman, Schofield, and Winston teachers' Bibles and other popular publications, including the easier Bible dictionaries and religious encyclopedias. The central position of the typical Kohathites was arranged for by God also to type the logical relation of the antitypical Kohathites to the central thought of all four antitypical camps and to each stewardship doctrine in each of these four antitypical camps. In other words, their Old and New Testament recensional, and their lexical, grammatical, translational, concordantial, introductory, interpretational, harmonetical, historical,

biographical, archeological, chronological, geo-graphical, apologetic, dogmatic and ethical works, ministered as to the Divine Power as exhibited in the camp of antitypical Judah, as to the Divine Wisdom as seen in the camp of antitypical Reuben, as to the Divine Justice as present in the camp of antitypical Ephraim and as to the Divine Love as manifest in the camp of antitypical Dan. Not only so, but these four attributes were by them singly emphasized as apparent in each one of the three stewardship doctrines in each of the four antitypical camps. And it was also to type this emphasis on the four attributes in themselves and upon each of them singly related to its respective three stewardship doctrines that the Kohathites were placed in the exact center of the host, as it marched.

(44) We are now in a position in which we can give added proof that the camps in their marching order do not give so much the time as the thought or logical order of the antitypical host. Not only the facts given above prove the logical more than the chronological order as applying in the order of the antitypical march, but also the positions of the Priests and the three groups of the Levites in the antitypical march prove this. As a matter of time order the marching was as to each denomination preceded first by the Priests' blowing an alarm that began a Priestly movement; this in every case was later by the crown-lost leaders perverted into a sect by their offering their symbolic bowl, charger and spoon, whereby they began to march; thereafter the pertinent antitypical tribe would begin its march. If the viewpoint of the typical march were to show this of the priests in their relation to each tribe, instead of some of the priests being represented as bearing the ark ahead of the host and others of them as blowing an alarm for the four camps, the priests, apart from those bearing the ark, would have been divided into twelve groups, one of which would in each case have marched ahead of the

pertinent prince, blowing the alarm. This is avoided in the type, partly doubtless because there were not enough priests available for it, and more especially because God wanted to picture forth other viewpoints from the standpoint of the antitype: (1) the oneness of the entire Priesthood; (2) their furthering the antitypical Ark; (3) their special relationship to the four Divine attributes by using them to sound the antitypical alarm for the starting of each of the antitypical camps; and (4) God brings out the work of the Priests in starting out each antitypical tribe by another type, *viz*., Jacob begetting his sons. But the fact of the priests' marching ahead of the host bearing the ark shows that both the logical and part of the chronological order are at work in the antitype considered as one picture, but it does not give the details of the time order for the four camps and the twelve tribes. As a matter of fact, in the antitype the alarm-blowing is a part of the Ark bearing. And the alarm-blowing proves that the logical more than the time order prevails in the antitype.

(45) Again, in the antitype the Levites associated with each antitypical tribe do their work in the time order of that particular tribe. Thus in each denomination the Gershonites do their justification and sanctification work while that antitypical tribe starts out on, proceeds with and ends its part of the march. Similarly, the antitypical Merarites do their editorial and printing and publishing work during the same stages of their pertinent tribal marches. The same is true as to the work of the antitypical Kohathites. But just as it was not the purpose of this type to bring out all the time order of the Priests' work in trumpeting an alarm, nor of the journeying of the Priests with their pertinent tribes; so it was not the purpose of this type to bring out all the time relations of the antitypical Levites in their journeying, nor their relations to the denominations with which they have been associated. Rather the purpose of their part in the type was to

bring out their logical relation to the antitypical camps and tribes as distinct from their chronological order and tribal association. Thus the relations of both the Priests and the Levites to their pertinent antitypical tribes are ignored in this type in order to bring out, so far as the Priests are concerned, the thought that they led the antitypical host as a whole logically and chronologically and as consisting of four camps; while, so far as the antitypical Levites are concerned, the typical purpose is to bring out simply their logical relations to the Priests, to crown-lost leaders, to one another and, so far as concerns the antitypical Gershonites and Merarites, to the antitypical first and second camps, and, so far as the antitypical Kohathites are concerned, to all four of the camps. Consequently the relation of the Levites to the marching is entirely logical and not at all chronological. Thus we see that the whole picture leans much more strongly to the logical than to the chronological order, which however is not entirely ignored, as can be seen in the priests' marching ahead of the whole, in their sounding the alarms for the four camps, in the time order of all three tribes in all four antitypical camps in journeying and in the time order of the Levites toward one another: first the Gershonites, second the Merarites and last the Kohathites.

(46) V. 22 brings to our attention the journeying of the third camp—that of Ephraim, to the west of the tabernacle. As already shown, the camp of Ephraim typed the antitypical camp that stands for the attribute of Divine Justice. How this is true of the antitypical camp as a whole and of each of the three stewardship doctrines of its tribes, we have shown above. It will now be in order to describe the antitypical journeying of antitypical Ephraim, the Lutheran Church. As with the march of every other denomination, it was preceded by the alarm blown by the antitypical Priests (v. 8). As we have seen, all the Reformation leaders proclaimed

the four fundamental truths of the Reformation: (1) justification by faith alone; (2) the Bible alone, the source and rule of faith and practice; (3) the sole headship of Christ to the Church, and (4) the sole priesthood of consecrated believers. Accordingly, Wessel, Savonarola and Luther, who began as star-members of the Philadelphia Church to blow the antitypical alarm preceding the journeying of the Lutheran Church, proclaimed all four of these messages controversially against Rome's contrary claims on each of the four involved points; but while Luther proclaimed all four of these messages, he laid much more stress on the first than on any of the others. His experiences, the needs of the times and the greater annihilative power of this doctrine than of the other three as against the Romanist system made him give the main stress to this doctrine. But unknown to him God had designed it so for very practical reasons. It certainly, as he presented it, was an alarm-blowing. Very few controversialists have wrought greater havoc on their opponents' positions than Luther. This accounts for Rome's counting him the greatest and most mischievous of heretics. The immense commotion that his preaching raised in the religious and political world shows that it was meat in due season. And he preached it in season and out of season for himself. He greatly loved this doctrine; for it rescued him from the torments of conscience, unappeasable through works' righteousness, into peace with God (Rom. 5: 1). His ablest and most detailed exposition of this doctrine is found in his larger commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, which commentary is one of the greatest classics of the Age.

(47) His announcing this doctrine in the 95 theses that he nailed to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg, Saxony, Germany, immediately aroused a storm. Romanist theologians, sensing the mortality of the blow to their entire theory of salvation, girded

on their armor to measure swords with Luther; and from that time onward Luther's life was largely filled with controversy. And on the four principles of the Reformation, particularly on that of justification by faith alone, he proved an invincible warrior. Throwing the methods of the schools to the winds, he fought as a champion of the people, understood, trusted and loved by them for his rugged honesty, simplicity, candor, charity and courage. Undoubtedly he was one of the greatest heroes and geniuses of the race. But he was more: He was a man of God. His controversy with Eck, Rome's ablest controversialist of those times, enlisted on his side his Divinely provided companion helper, Philip Melanchthon, as gentle as Luther was rugged, as scholarly as Luther was popular, as timid as Luther was brave. Thus they were complements of one another. The Lord's wisdom in making Luther the star-member and Melanchthon the companion in this pair is thus manifest. Soon other Priests were enlisted on their side, blowing away on the silver trumpets the alarm, especially on justification by faith. Shortly, crown-lost leaders joined them. Among these were Frederick the Wise and John the Steadfast, both electors of Saxony, thus Luther's rulers. A large number of theologians gathered to them; and shortly the offering of their bowl, charger and spoon began to pervert the Lutheran movement into a sect, a work in which Luther and Melanchthon, sad to say, joined. Such offering of these antitypical vessels started antitypical Elishama (*my God hears*), the son of Ammihud (*my people is honorable*), on his march as the leader of antitypical Ephraim, the Lutheran Church as a sect. These were soon joined by other zealous sectarians, who controversially entered the discussions on the stewardship doctrine of the Lutheran Church, justification by faith alone, especially on its cleansing and refutative aspects, but also in its doctrinal and ethical features. As thus the first of the Lutheran ledlings began

such activities, they antityped the tribe of Ephraim entering its journey; and as they continued therein and others kept joining and continuing with them therein, they antityped the continuance of the tribe of Ephraim in its journeying. And when they come to a halt preparatory to their entering into the earthly features of the Kingdom as a part of the Millennial camp, they will consist of those Ex-Lutherans who as a part of the Epiphany camp will come up to the Millennial camp. This activity of the alarm-blowing Priests and of the crown-lost leaders and members of the Lutheran Church furthered and vindicated Divine Justice, which was the intention of the work.

(48) Next in the type (v. 23) marched the tribe of Manasseh (*forgotten*) under the leadership of Gamaliel (*recompense, or reward, of God*), the son of Pedahzur (*the deliverer is a rock*). The tribe of Manasseh types the Congregational Church. Their stewardship doctrine is: the equality of the brethren as Priests before God and their fellows as to justice. The Congregational form of church government arose in revulsion against episcopacy, which made some lords over the flock, instead of making all brethren under Christ's lordship (Matt. 20: 24-28; 23: 8-10). Thus this stewardship doctrine emphasized justice as between the brethren. Lordship as against brotherhood was very marked in the Church of England, in which the bishops and archbishops are addressed as, My lord, in direct contradiction of Jesus' words cited above. Their lording it over the household was quite obnoxious to Robert Browne, who clearly saw the contradiction between their titles and prerogatives and the teachings of Christ announced in the above-cited passages. The episcopal form of church government was a gross corruption of the original congregational church polity. And against it Robert Browne appeared. He pointed out the Priesthood of all believers as making them equal before the bar of God and the bar of

church law. According to him, there was no distinction before the bar of the congregation's polity between the so-called clergy and laity. The former were not lords, but servants, though abler brethren, yet serving brethren to all the consecrated brethren in the ecclesia. Justice as between brethren before the bar of church polity he insisted upon. This involved him into controversy against the Church-State, England. Repeatedly it led to his imprisonment. But he continued to stand for his position; and even when he rejoined the Church of England as a minister, it was on condition of his refusing to be episcopally ordained and lorded over. Thus he sounded the alarm on congregational church government grounded on the Priesthood, hence brotherhood, and equality before the bar of justice for all consecrated brethren.

(49) The companion helper, the non-star part of the two of whom Robert Browne was the star part, seems to have been Robert Harrison, with whom he was closely associated for a number of years in the study and advocacy of the doctrine that as an alarm they blew forth on the priestly trumpets. He was also the assistant pastor of the ecclesia at Norwich, wherein Robert Browne was pastor. They both went with their congregation to Holland when persecution drove them out of England; and Harrison became the pastor of that ecclesia when Browne with a number of its members returned to England. Harrison wrote some on the subject of their common teaching, though in such activity Browne greatly excelled him. Thus these two Priests began to blow out this message on their silver trumpets. Other Priests joined them and a priestly movement resulted. In Chapter VI we described Browne's activities, but had not by that time learned who was his companion helper, hence have here given something on him as such. It was not long after Browne, Harrison and their colaborers started to advocate this doctrine in the way of a controversy, alarm,

that crown-lost leaders joined the movement, perverting it into a sect. They offered their bowl, charger and spoon; and shortly after beginning that activity, perverted the priestly movement into a sect. Their offering the antitypical vessels started them out on the journey, antitypical of the start of Gamaliel, the son of Pedahzur, who led the journeying of the tribe of Manasseh. Their offering these antitypical vessels resulted in attracting to them as sectarian leaders an ever increasing number of Congregationalists, who controversially marched with them, refuting Presbyterianism, Episcopalism and higher hierarchical forms culminating in papacy. They controverted these both refutatively and correctionally, as they also set forth their view on the pertinent stewardship teaching doctrinally and ethically. These continued to attract an ever increasing number of like-minded sectarians. Their beginning such a course antitypes the start of the tribe of Manasseh on the march. Their continuing such a course antitypes this tribe's progress on its march. And the arrival of such believers at the Millennial camp antitypes the Manassehites' ending their journey to Paran. Their doing these things furthered and vindicated Justice. For details on the Priests and crown-lost leaders of the Congregational Church, kindly refer to Chapter VI.

(50) We now come (v. 24) to the discussion of the last tribe of the third camp, *viz.*, Benjamin (*son of the right hand*). Its prince was Abidan (*my father is judge*), the son of Gideoni (*my mighty warrior*). Details on antitypical Benjamin are given in Chapter VI. As there shown, the tribe of Benjamin about the tabernacle types the fanatical sects: Quakers, Irvingerites, Mormons, Holiness people, Free Methodists and the various faith-curist cults, such as the Dowieites, Christian Missionary Alliancists, etc. Their stewardship doctrine is: True religion is love to God with all the heart, soul, mind and strength, and to the neighbor

as self. This is but a summary of the law (Matt. 22: 36-40), and therefore is the essence of justice, which in some form or other must appear in the stewardship doctrine of each of the three denominations to the antitypical Tabernacle's west. Just as the false polity of the Church of England occasioned the Browne movement, which was later perverted into the Congregational denomination, so the dry formalism and largely worldly life of the bulk of the Anglican Church members occasioned the Little Flock movement that was later perverted into the mother sect of the fanatical sects, Quakerism. The Little Flock brother who was raised up to become the leader of the movement that was later perverted into the fanatical sects, especially Quakerism, was George Fox, whom we must keep separate and distinct from John Foxe, the author of the great work, Acts and Monuments of the Martyrs, which among the English-speaking people has done the papacy more injury than any other Protestant work. George Fox could find no satisfaction for his hunger for true religion in the Church of England, nor in the Calvinistic (Presbyterian and Congregational) and Baptist Churches in England. After years of searching for true religion in these four denominations, he sought it in the Bible, in self examinations and in fellowship with others of a like mind. He found it in the teaching and practice of supreme love to God and equal love to the neighbor, *i.e.*, in the theory and practice of justice, proper duty love Godward and manward. He then began to present this thought controversially, in opposition to the teachings and practices of the above-mentioned denominations. Thus, as a part of the Philadelphia star, he began to blow an alarm.

(51) Fox's special companion helper was Robert Barclay, the author of the Apology For The People Called Quakers, which with Fox's Journal and his Gospel Truth Demonstrated is the most famous of

Quaker writings. Barclay was a scholarly man, which Fox was not, and thus he in a literary way furthered the movement more than Fox, whose preaching more than made up for his literary inferiority. These two were soon joined in the antitypical alarm-trumpeting by other Little Flock brethren; and soon a vigorous reform movement was in active sway in England which spread to the English colonies in the West Indies and America. To this movement rallied some brethren who as crown-lost leaders (Penn, Fisher, Pennington, etc.) perverted the movement into the Quaker sect. From time to time other crown-lost leaders arose as the heads of other fanatical sects, as children of Quakerism, like Irving, (Joseph) Smith, (Brigham) Young, Murray, Dowie, Simpson, etc. All of these with varying fanatical bents joined in offering the antitypical bowl, charger and spoon on the stewardship doctrine of the whole movement and perverted it into the various fanatical sects. In making those offerings, the prince of antitypical Benjamin—Abidan—started out on the march typed in v. 24. Soon to these crown-lost leaders were gathered sectarian members, who controversially set forth their stewardship doctrine of true religion as consisting of supreme love for God and equal love for the neighbor. They controverted especially, but not exclusively, against the four denominations mentioned in the preceding paragraph. They did this mainly both refutatively and correctionally, though also doctrinally and ethically. And more or less the spirit of their stewardship doctrine is seen in their lives, which is the reason, *e.g.*, for the Quakers and Holiness people leading such upright lives. As they entered into the pertinent controversies, they antityped the Benjamites' starting out on their journey from Sinai (v. 24); their proceeding therein antitypes the Benjamites' proceeding on the journey to Paran; and as they, swallowed up by their successors of the Epiphany camp, come to the Millennial conditions, they

will antitype the Benjamites' reaching Paran. In so doing they furthered and vindicated Divine Justice. We will now make a remark most fitting here, because this antitypical tribe is the fanatical sects, though in principle the remark is applicable to all of the sects of each denomination, *viz.*, As the various sects of this antitypical tribe journeyed and will come to the journey's end, they antitype the chief families of the Benjamites, journeying from Sinai and coming to Paran.

(52) V. 25 introduces the journeying of the fourth camp, that of Dan (*judge*), whose prince was Ahiezer (*my brother is a helper*), the son of Ammishaddai (*my people is almighty*). As previously shown, the thought common to the three antitypical tribes to the north of the antitypical Tabernacle is Divine Love, the highest of all the Divine attributes. Two of the tribes to the north of the tabernacle were Dan and Naphtali, sons of Rachel's maid, Bilhah; while the third, Asher, was the younger son of Leah's maid, Zilpah. In the antitype, therefore, the three denominations typed respectively by these (the Baptists, the Unitario-Universalists and Methodists) have been in spirit nearer to the Little Flock than any of the other nine denominations. It is doubtless for this reason that their stewardship doctrines are an expression of disinterested love in some form or other. This remark applies to their earlier journeyings more than to their later journeyings; for now, *e.g.*, the Unitario-Universalists are probably farther away from Bible standards than any other Protestant denomination. But at the outstart and for a considerable part of their journeying, they were the most honorable of honorable women, denominations (Ps. 45: 9). That teaching which afterward became the stewardship doctrine of the Baptists was as an antitypical alarm first symbolically trumpeted by Balthazar Hubmaier, *viz.*, Only the truly justified and consecrated are God's real people. Hence he was a member of the Philadelphia star. He did his work

thoroughly and ably; for while yet in the papacy he was, next to Eck (Luther's ablest opponent), counted the ablest of Romanist controversialists. His able controversies on this doctrine are just what we should expect of the Little Flock leader of the firstborn of antitypical Rachel's maid, antitypical Bilhah. He was involved in controversy continually, with Eck, Luther and Zwingli, as well as with sectarian leaders among his adherents. Thus he certainly blew an alarm on the antitypical trumpet, starting one of the most spiritual of the Little Flock movements between the Harvests.

(53) Hubmaier's companion helper was a Swiss called Blaurock (*blue coat*), because of his wearing a coat of that color. Indeed, in the beginning the movement was largely a Swiss movement, until by Hubmaier's banishment and the ruthless persecution stirred up by Zwingli himself against the involved brethren in Switzerland, Hubmaier and many others emigrated to Moravia. With zeal and perseverance Blaurock supported Hubmaier; and for some time after Hubmaier's banishment Blaurock kept up the work in Switzerland amid many privations and tortures, finally ending his ministry, like Hubmaier's, in a martyr's death. There rallied to these two leaders many other capable brethren and many who were not very capable. These kept up the blowing of the alarm, especially against infant baptism as disorderly, seeing infants could not really experience personal justification and consecration, and hence could not be God's real people and, accordingly, could not be fit candidates for water baptism. Satan was present to pervert this movement by socialistic and fanatical schemes which gave a great black eye to the movement, despite the fact that such evils were fought by the movement's Little Flock leaders, etc. Then appeared the crown-lost leaders, among them, Simon Menno, the chief among these. By offering their bowl, charger and spoon on the chief doctrine of the movement—only the truly justified and consecrated are

God's real people—they started out on their part in antitypical Dan's journeying. We would here parenthetically remark that since the heart of true consecration is disinterested love, the stewardship doctrine of the Baptist Church is an expression of Divine Love. After the crown-lost leaders had begun to offer their antitypical bowl, charger and spoon on the pertinent doctrine, they were soon joined by an ever-increasing number of followers, who took up the controversy in support of their leaders, inveighing against the nominal Christianity, churchianity of the adherents of the state churches in various European countries; for to be a nominal Christian in those days meant external membership in a state church. They joined the controversy both refutationally and correctionally, though they also presented their stewardship teaching doctrinally and ethically. So doing, they antityped the journeying of the tribe of Dan. Their beginning such a course antitypes Dan's starting his journeying. Their proceeding in such a course antitypes Dan's continuing his journeying. And their ending this course in their successors of the Epiphany camp coming to the Kingdom conditions antitypes Dan's reaching Paran. This course of theirs furthered and vindicated the Divine attribute of love. We might remark that the fearful persecutions that the Baptists received from the Reformed, Lutheran, Romanist, Greek and Episcopal churches and their hounding by the Methodist, Campbellite and Adventist churches, antitypes the distress that Rachel and her maid's children felt at Leah's and her maid's hands. Details on antitypical Dan are given in Chapter VII.

(54) V. 26 brings to our attention the journeying of Asher (*happy, fortunate*), whose prince was Pagiel (*interventions of God*), the son of Okran (*trouble-some*). As we have seen, in Chapter VII, the tribe of Asher types the Methodist Church. Asher was the second son of Leah's maid. This fact typically implies their being less remote to the Little Flock spirit than

any others of antitypical Leah's children and antitypical Zilpah's older son, whose older age shows him to have more of the Leah spirit than Asher. Hence this Church received a stewardship doctrine very closely related to the spirit of the Little Flock; and its type was stationed about the tabernacle in a position between the two tribes nearest related to Rachel's legal children as distinct from her personal children. That this remark be not misunderstood, we would say that in the tabernacle picture Rachel's direct descendants type different things from Joseph and Benjamin in the Jacob figure. The stewardship doctrine of the Methodist Church is: Perfect love is the Divine ideal for God's people. The Methodists sometimes called it entire sanctification, and sometimes perfection. Their view of it has sometimes been represented by opponents as sinlessness. Indeed, this was due, in part, to unguarded expressions thereon by some of the Methodist leaders themselves, including even John Wesley, and, in part, to the direct claim of fanatical Methodist sectarians (Free Methodists especially) who claimed to live sinlessly, some of them claiming to have lived so for 30 and even 40 years. The Little Flock member whom God raised up to trumpet as an alarm the doctrine of Divine love as God's ideal for His people was John Wesley. A Church of England minister, the dead formalism and worldly life of the bulk of the Anglican clergy and laity repelled him; and he earnestly sought a heart and life religion, as contrasted with the head and dead religion in the Church of England. To gain this for himself and others, he stressed justification and sanctification, culminating in perfect love, as the way to attain it. His methods of bringing people to such a life moved the clergy to shut their church doors in his face; and when to attain his purpose he resorted to field preaching, they fought him as unchurchly. Undaunted, he continued to trumpet his alarm message all over Great Britain and Ireland by word and pen,

which resulted in a vigorous Priestly movement coming into existence. Wesley was indefatigable. For nearly 53 years, from his 36th until ⅔ through his 89th year, he labored by voice and pen as few others have done, for his stewardship truth—justification and sanctification as steps to attain the Divine love, God's ideal for His people. The only longer serving members of the seven stars seem to have been St. John and Polycarp, the former having served about 70 and the latter about 65 years as star-members. Wesley was both a most loving and lovable man. And controversy for his stewardship doctrine did not at all mar his holy spirit of goodness, to which he was undoubtedly aided by the character of that doctrine, which naturally tended to mellow one.

(55) Soon John Wesley was joined in his alarm-trumpeting by his brother, Charles. So far as we know, while there were three pairs of brothers in the Apostolic band (Peter and Andrew, James and John, and James and Jude), John and Charles Wesley were the only brothers in flesh that became one of the pairs of the seventy general elders, secondarily prophets, sent out as 35 pairs between the two Harvests. Charles, in addition to being John's companion helper, became the greatest and perhaps most prolific hymn-writer of all times. He gave to his and succeeding generations about 6,000 hymns, some of which, like, Jesus, Lover of My Soul, are among the finest hymns in existence. In holy union with his brother, Charles took lusty hold of the trumpet and blew out the alarm thereon, as long as he lived. And these were joined speedily by as fine a set of faithful Priests as can be found in any Little Flock movement of the period between the two Harvests; for the Wesleyan movement was as spiritual a movement as arose between the Harvests. These devoted Priests blew the alarm faithfully. Soon there mingled among them crown-lost leaders, like Whitefield, Coke, Clark, etc., etc. Later others, like Watson,

Whedon, Simpson, Hurst, Buckley, etc., joined the Methodists, and as crown-lost leaders all of these joined in offering the antitypical bowl, charger and spoon. In so doing, as the antitype of Pagiel, they set out as the prince of antitypical Asher on the march antitypical of v. 26. To these rallied in ever-increasing numbers sectarian Methodists who were not Spirit-begotten. Bravely they entered the fray, contending controversially for their stewardship doctrine: The Divine love attained through justification and sanctification is God's ideal for His people. They used this doctrine refutatively and correctionally as against dead formalism and worldly mindedness; and they also set forth this teaching doctrinally and ethically, doctrinally with more or less corruptions introduced by their crown-lost leaders. In starting out in such a course they antityped Asher's starting out on his journey (v. 26). As they proceeded therein they antityped Asher's continuing on that three days' journey. And as they in their Epiphany camp representatives reach the Millennial conditions, they will antitype Asher's reaching Paran. So doing, they have furthered and vindicated Divine Love. We have given details on matters connected with antitypical Asher in Chapter VII.

(56) V. 27 brings us to the journeying of Naphtali (*wrestling*), the last tribe of the fourth camp. The prince of this tribe was Ahira (*my brother is great*), the son of Enan (*springy, fountainlike*). The antitype of the tribe of Naphtali is the Unitario-Universalist Church. Their stewardship doctrine is: There is but one God, whose chief attribute is love. Originally this Church had a very large quantity of truth, *i.e.*, the unity of God as against the trinity, man's mortality as against the inherent immortality of the soul, death, the wages of sin, as against eternal torment, and future probation as against this life ending all probation. Naphtali's being a son of Rachel's maid accounts for his antitype's having so much Truth, revelatory of his

near relation to the Little Flock. But, sad to say, Unitario-Universalists have fallen greatly away from early priestly teachings. They even deny the ransom as the corresponding price; and in their higher criticism they are in the forefront of the infidelistic movements as a denomination. To most of them the Bible is an uninspired collection of books, largely erroneous. Most of them deny our Lord's Immaculate Conception. In their Universalistic section they believe in the salvation of all men and devils, including Satan. As a Protestant denomination they are now, perhaps, the farthest away from the Truth of any Protestant denomination. The Little Flock brother who trumpeted the alarm on the unity of the one God of Love, as against the trinity, was Michael Servetus. He was born a Spaniard, but spent most of his adult life in France. He was a member of the suite of Charles V during the Diet of Augsburg, 1530, where and when the Lutherans presented their (Augsburg) confession of faith. Servetus, an imperial courtier, had to practice a great deal of diplomacy in his contacts with Romanists and Protestants. He took a lively interest in the controversies of that time; but, apart from sharing them with a few intimate friends, he kept his views largely to himself; for they were as much opposed to those of other Protestants as to those of the Romanists; for four of his teachings, as above given, were the antitheses of the four doctrines that are "their resemblance through all the earth" (Zech. 5: 6)—trinity, immortality, eternal torment and probation limited to this life. In these four great errors most Protestants and all Greek and Roman Catholics resemble one another—they are "their resemblance through all the earth." In 1531, at the age of 20, he published his book, On the Errors of the Trinity. The next year he sent forth a revised edition of this book, meeting therein the objections urged against its first edition. Then, because almost nobody responded to his views, he forsook the Emperor's suite and went to

France. He was rather quiet there on his teaching as to the four above-mentioned errors, because of the extreme danger in that Romanist country. His appointment to debate with Calvin in 1536 at Paris on the subject of the trinity was not kept by him for his well-grounded fear of the latter's betraying him to the Romanists. With almost no one else did he discuss the subject for ten years. Then, in 1546, he opened up his controversy on the subject by letter with Calvin. In 1553 he sent Calvin a copy of his latest book on, The Restoration of True Christianity, which was, of course, anti-trinitarian, and which ultimately led to his burning at the stake through Calvin's instigation, at Geneva, after Calvin had stirred up the French Inquisition to seek to burn him at Lyon, France. But in argument Servetus was mighty on the unity of the God of Love as against the trinity. Thus he blew the alarm on his trumpet, which the Trinitarians much dreaded.

(57) As was the case with Thomas Campbell in relation to Barton Stone as his companion helper, and with J. Wolf in relation to William Miller as his companion helper, so Laelius Socinus never came into direct personal contact with Servetus—he helped the latter unconsciously and at a distance. Laelius Socinus started to sound the trumpet alarm in Italy, but the Inquisition's designs on his life compelled him to flee to Switzerland; and there he worked quietly and privately through various publications. So hard did antitypical Leah's children make it for the second son of antitypical Rachel's maid! Nevertheless, he did well for the cause. Servetus and Socinus found priestly helpers here and there, as widely separated voices crying out in the dark night of trinitarianism, human immortality, eternal torment and no-future-probationism. Thus a Priestly movement, small indeed and lacking local touch, was here and there represented by a lone Priest, blowing an alarm on his symbolic trumpet. One of Laelius Socinus' disciples was a nephew of his,

Faustus Socinus, who, as the first one of the crown-lost leaders connected with this priestly movement, took an active part in the pertinent controversy, first in Italy, then in Switzerland and finally in Poland. Other crown-lost leaders joined the movement and sectarianized it, for instance, Davidis, and in later centuries, Priestley, Coleridge, Channing, Norton, Abbott, etc. These offered their bowl, charger and spoon, and thus as antitypical Ahira started out in the march antitypical of the one described in v. 27. These were joined by unconsecrated partisans, sectarians, out of whom these crown-lost leaders built up the Unitario-Universalist denomination. These joined controversially in the discussion of the stewardship doctrine of this growing denomination: The one God is perfect in love, as his chief attribute. They presented it refutationally and correctionally as against trinity, inherent immortality, no-future-probation and eternal torment. They also presented it doctrinally and ethically. In so doing, they antityped Naphtali's journeying according to v. 27. Their starting out on this course antityped Naphtali's starting the journeying of v. 27. Their proceeding thereon antityped his continuing thereon. And their ending it in their Epiphany aspect at antitypical Paran antitypes Naphtali's reaching Paran. By so doing they furthered and vindicated Divine Love. Details on this subject will be found in Chapter VII. It will be noted that v. 28 summarizes the details given in vs. 11-27, even as Num. 7: 84-88 summarizes the offerings of the princes of the 12 tribes, given in detail before.

(58) In vs. 29-32 is given an episode that took place just as the departure from Sinai was occurring. That it occurred just as the departure from Sinai was taking place is apparent: (1) from the location that it was given in the narrative—between the two parts of the description of the journeying (vs. 11-28 and vs. 33-36); (2) from Moses' statements ("we are journeying

. . . come thou with us"); (3) from Hobab's answer (v. 30); and (4) from Moses' entreaties ("Leave us not . . . if thou wilt go with us . . . what goodness . . . will we do unto thee"). Since the departure from antitypical Sinai occurred during the Jewish Harvest, the wilderness of Sinai typing Jewry, this episode types something that occurred during the Jewish Harvest. We understand it to type our Lord's entreaties to fleshly Israel to accompany spiritual Israel on its Gospel-Age journeyings, thus becoming a part of spiritual Israel, and fleshly Israel's refusal to do so. The details will show this view of the antitype to be correct. Hobab (*beloved*; Rom. 11: 28) was Moses' brother-in-law (Judg. 1: 16; 4: 11, A.R.V.), since he was the son of Moses' father-in-law (v. 29), the confusion of calling him Moses' father-in-law (Judg. 1: 16; 4: 11) in the A.V. arising from the fact that the word *chothen* means *father-in-law*, *son-in-law* and *bridegroom*. A comparison of v. 29 and Ex. 18: 1-12 identifies Jethro and Raguel, or Reuel (Ex. 2: 18). In passing, it will be noted that while Hobab did not accompany Moses and Israel, some of his descendants as Kenites either did so or later went to Palestine (Judg. 1: 16; 4: 11). In this picture Moses' asking Hobab to accompany Israel represents our Lord's either directly seeking Israel's conversion while He was in the flesh, or indirectly seeking their conversion through the Apostles and other brethren, like Stephen, Barnabas, Apollos, Timothy, etc., after He had become a glorified Spirit. Israel, as a son of God—Raguel—(Hos. 11: 1), was thus a brother-in-law of our Lord as a New Creature, even as our Lord as such is the Bridegroom of Jehovah's daughter (Ps. 45: 10, 13). Of course, by this we are not to understand that Jesus is not directly a Son of God. The viewpoint of the son and daughter in Hos. 11: 1 and Ps. 45: 10, 13 is that of class respects rather than of an individual respect. And Jesus, not being a class under this class

type, is represented as a son-in-law of God from the standpoint of Jethro (Reuel, Raguel) and his family (Ex. 2: 16-23). Please compare this with P '31, 169, par. 18 to 170, par. 19. That our Lord while in the flesh directly sought Israel's conversion is evident from His entire ministry, which activity He pathetically and with tears sums up in the words, "How oft would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not" (Matt. 23: 37-39; Luke 19: 41-44). In seeking their conversion ("come with us"), He set before them the offer of the high calling of the Seed to the Divine nature and heirship of God ("we are journeying to the place of which the Lord said, I will give it to you," Gen. 22: 16-18). Seeking to gather the Seed and knowing that the blessing was first to be offered to Israel (John 1: 11-13; Rom. 1: 16), He confined His ministry to Israel, seeking its lost sheep (Matt. 15: 24). Often our Lord directly promised Israel great blessings ("we will do thee good," Matt. 22: 1-4; John 6: 26-58, etc.). Similarly he sought to win them through the Apostles and others; and by these He offered them great blessings (Matt. 10: 6; Luke 10: 1-16; Acts 1: 8; 2: 14-40; 3: 12-26; 13: 16-49). His and their elaborations of the glorious things of the high calling before Israel is typed by the words, "For the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel."

(59) Hobab's refusal to accept Moses' invitation to accompany him and Israel from Sinai to Canaan (v. 30), types Israel's refusal to come into the sphere of the Truth and of the Spirit of the Truth even unto the Kingdom. This refusal was made in word and act. Their rejections of it in word were made in that they contradicted the offer of Jesus and His mouthpieces throughout the Jewish Harvest. Their rejecting it in deed was made in that they persecuted and put Jesus to death and persecuted His mouthpieces, torturing many of them and other disciples and putting some of

them and other disciples to death (Matt. 22: 5, 6). St. Paul describes the matter in great detail in Rom. 9, 10 and 11. Thus the facts of the case are in full harmony with the viewpoint of the type as given above. Hobab's saying that he would depart to his own land and to his own kindred types the Jews' saying by word and act that they would keep to the sphere of the Law and its spirit and to the people who held to the sphere of the Law and its spirit. The facts of the Jewish Harvest and of the Gospel Age, so far as they concern Israel as a nation, show that they have done this. In this they have experienced the disfavor and tribulations typed by the experiences of Hagar and Ishmael in the desert, banished from Abraham's home.

(60) But they were not allowed to take such an unprofitable course without remonstrance and entreaties to the contrary from our Lord, directly made to them while He was in the flesh, and indirectly made by Him to them after He was in the spirit through His mouthpieces. These remonstrances and entreaties are set forth typically in vs. 31 and 32. Notice the remonstrance and entreaty in the words, "Leave us not, I pray thee!" How these words remind us of Jesus' loving exhortations to the Jews, especially as we find these in John 6-8 and 10! How they remind us of the remonstrances and entreaties of Peter and Paul as recorded in the Acts! Moses' making it an honorable thing, as an inducement for Hobab to go along, that he might act as a competent guide (v. 31), was done in an effort to win him over to going along with Israel. This types the fact that Jesus and His mouthpieces honored Israel with the offer of the first place as leaders of the others, if they would go along with Spiritual Israel. As Hobab knew the wilderness stations well ("thou knowest how we are to encamp"), he fittingly typed Israel, whose studies of the Law and the Prophets gave them much of Truth. They also had other helps for the Truth, similar to those that the

antitypical Kohathites in their linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic works furnish the Priesthood ("thou mayest be to us instead of eyes"). This persuasive invitation was offered to Israel as an inducement highly complimentary to them and as quite likely, if possible, to secure their favorable response; for such an appeal with a good heart would win, when almost every other appeal would fail. The appeal is made all the stronger in v. 32. Notice the repetition, "It shall be . . . yea it shall be," which, as a specially earnest entreaty, shows Moses' intense desire for Hobab to accompany them. This types the especially earnest appeals that Jesus and His mouthpieces made to Israel, to win them over after they seemed bent on rejecting the gracious and frequent offers of the high calling. It was to avert from Israel this loss and their consequent troubles, that Jesus and His mouthpieces re-repeated with loving intensity the offer of the Gospel-Age blessings and privileges to Israel. Moses added to the offer of doing Hobab good, made in v. 29, the promise to give him whatever God gave to Israel, in spite of his having rejected the first offer. This types the fact that Jesus and His mouthpieces promised to Fleshly Israel that if they would change their purpose they would be incorporated into Spiritual Israel, with all the blessings and privileges of Spiritual Israel (Rom. 11: 23, 24), their first rejection not being allowed to result in any prejudice against them. Certainly in repeatedly offering the Gospel-Age blessings and privileges to Israel after their first rejecting them, Jesus and His mouthpieces in the Jewish Harvest antityped the offers of v. 32. Hobab kept to his first refusal, doubtless to Moses' keen grief. So Israel as a people maintained its first refusal, and we know that it was to the keen grief of Jesus and His mouthpieces (Matt. 23: 37-29; Luke 19: 41-44; Rom. 9: 2, 3). While they stumbled in the Jewish Harvest (Rom. 11: 7-12), we thank God that they are arising to more and

more favor, which will soon reach its full fruition (Rom. 11: 25-36). The Hobab episode is another confirmation that we have understood aright Israel's journey from Sinai to Paran in its antitype.

(61) We gave the antitype of v. 33 above while giving the proofs that the journey from Sinai to Paran represented the Gospel-Age journey of God's real and nominal Spiritual Israel. This and the other references to this passage in this article have added to its exposition a sufficiency of explanation to make its antitype clear. Therefore we will not here repeat these explanations. These same remarks apply to v. 34, whose statement that it was the cloud, not the pillar of fire, that was upon them the day they went out of the camp at Sinai, proves that the journey began, not between the Harvests, when it was night, but in one of the Harvests, which were days as distinct from the night between them and the Epiphany night after the Parousia day. The day time of their departure, combined with the facts given throughout this chapter, proves that in the antitype it was made during the Jewish Harvest. Moses' prayers as recorded in vs. 35 and 36 are in line with the thought that progress is grace, knowledge and service in the Christian life is typed by the marching (when the ark set forward) and that the encampings type the endurances of trials, sufferings and persecution in the Christian life (when it, the ark, rested). As we have seen, progress in knowledge, grace and service is made mainly amid controversy. It is for this reason that our Lord, as the antitypical Moses, prays for us as we are battling with error, sin, selfishness. and worldliness as our enemies, which, as such, are also our Father's enemies. And Jesus also prays for defeat against these enemies of God and God's people: "Rise up [in battle against Thy and Thy people's enemies], Lord, and let Thine enemies [let sin, error, selfishness and worldliness with their leaders, Satan, the world and the flesh] be scattered [completely defeated]; and

let them that hate Thee flee before Thee." Jesus in the antitype offers this prayer as an intercession for us and as an act of His that He greatly desires (prays) to be realized by Spiritual Israel's battling for its fulfillment. Thus the journeying of Israel types the aggressive part of the Christian warfare, which is growth in grace, knowledge and service amid struggle. The defensive part of the Christian warfare is endurance of attacks amid trials, sufferings and persecution. While therein temporarily new advancement is not made, yet tests are applied on previous attainments (when it, the ark, rested). The Lord Jesus prays that Jehovah should return from the aggressive fighting to the defense of His people: "Return [from pursuing the scattered enemies] unto [to defend] the many thousands of Israel." In this connection, where the journey from Sinai to Paran is especially described, there is special pertinency for this prayer; for the return will be to Millennial conditions (Paran), where God will especially defend against spiritual enemies the many thousands—the world of mankind—of Millennial Israel. It will be such a return as will spell restitution (Ps. 90: 3). With this we end our study of Num. 10 and of the first large division of Numbers (chapter 1-10), during the course of which we also, as we studied chapters 1 and 2, made a study of Num. 26. Thus with some detail we have studied nearly a third of the chapters and over a third of the subject matter of the book of Numbers. As the types so far studied show the organization of Israel into a settled nation, so the antitypes show nominal and spiritual Israel as organized into a settled symbolic nation. We praise God for the light that He has given us on this book so far, and pray Him to give us its further antitypical truths as due.

(1) What was studied in our last chapter? What is to be studied in this chapter? What kind of a connection is there between these two chapters? What is it? How do the two figures differ as to their antitypes? To what do both of them refer? What is the Biblical symbolic use of

a trumpet? Of its blowing? Why are the trumpets of Num. 10: 1-10 typical? How do the cited passages prove this? How as to quantity do the Scripture passages show this? Ex. 19: 13, 16, 19? Lev. 25: 9? Joshua 6: 4-9, 13, 16, 20; Rev. 8: 2-6? Judges 6: 34? 7: 16, 18-22? How do the other cited passages prove these thoughts of trumpets and their sounding? How does Hymn No. 24 show this? Sing it.

(2) Who was commanded to make the two trumpets? Whom does he here type? In what respect? Through whom did he make them? Whom do Bezaleel, Aholiab and their companions type? In what respects? What is pictured by the trumpets' being made of silver? Their being made of one whole piece? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What kind of things are typed by these two trumpets? Why is this true? What do they type? In what different forms may we express this thought? What does Rev. 15: 3 call these?

(3) Of what part of the Bible is the human salvation a general summary? What, generally speaking, is the Old Testament? What is it called in Rev. 15: 3? Why? Why is this reason true? What is the first line of thought implied in the song of Moses? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The final and seventh? Of what are these seven a general summary? How does one of the trumpets stand related to these seven?

(4) What other thing in this connection is a fact? What is it called in Rev. 15: 3? Like the human salvation, is it related to various things? How must they be regarded in relation to it? What is its first implication as to Christ? Second? Third? Fourth? What lines of thought does the high calling include? Of what are these teachings a general summary? How does this message stand related to the second trumpet of Num. 10: 1-10?

(5) What other kinds of thoughts are found in the Old and New Testaments? What decides to which of these two messages they belong? How is this seen in the Kingdom message? The Second Advent? The resurrection? What in this respect is the character of many Old Testament types and prophecies? How do the cited passages prove this? How are some of these often presented? How not? What kinds of thought's are also presented in the

New Testament? What remark was occasioned by such overlapping? What do the two trumpets not do typically on this head? With what are they not absolutely synonymous? What do they do as respects each other antitypically? What is the contrast between the two Testaments and the two antitypical trumpets in this respect? How are these two messages related? In fact, what are they? What does this relation between them prove?

(6) What do vs. 2-7 show? How many fold are they? What are they? What is meant by calling the people to assemble at the door of the tabernacle? By how many trumpets were they there assembled? By how many were the princes assembled? What is typed by the assembling? The princes? What is the difference between blowing two antitypical trumpets and blowing one? Why is this the true distinction? Why is it a mistake to give details of the deep things to the nominal people of God? What shows this view to be correct? Even in what is this true?

(7) At what time and under what circumstances is this especially to be seen? What illustrations show this? In what other branches of the work does this appear? When did we begin to give details on any particular subject? Who are included in the princes of v. 4? What proves this? How did they meet Moses? What does this type? What proves this to be true? Why was it necessary? What does giving details exclude? What did it require? Who had such experience in the Parousia? What did they find necessary to do at such occasions?

(8) What did these two kinds of gatherings serve? Of what three things did they partake with the nominal people of God? What is implied in the second of them? By what brethren were these things also done? How relatively? In what did such activity result throughout the Age? Even at what other time? With what instrumentalities? What purpose, finally, did such assembling of the nominal people of God have? What other kind of assembling was held? In what forms was it usually done? What were the first and second purposes of this activity? What facts illustrate the second of these? What was the third purpose? The fourth and final one?

(9) What do vs. 5-7 show? How is one described but not defined? How is the other defined? What does the

latter type? What does the Hebrew noun *teruah* mean? What does the Hebrew verb *rua*, from which *teruah* is derived, mean? The Hebrew word *taka*? What does the use of the latter word in Ps. 81: 4 show by contrast with the other two words? How is this contrast shown in vs. 3, 4, 7? What does v. 9 show as to *rua* and *teruah*? What does Num. 31: 6 show on this subject? What do the other passages in which *rua* is used teach on this head? Those in which *teruah* is used? What other consideration proves this thought? How does the Truth usually progress? What two sets of writings prove this?

(10) How is this illustrated in our Pastor's case as to Lev. 16 and much of the Tabernacle Shadows? The Ransom? The Sin-offering, Covenants and Mediator? The contrasts between Adam and Christ? Universal salvation from the curse and eternal universalism? The Second Advent controversy? Explain the types of such cited unfoldings? In the opening of what other form of Truth is this apparent? How does this appear in the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha? The sixth sifting? The slaughter weapons? The penny murmuring? Ruth, type and antitype? In many Scriptures in the controversy with J. F. R.? With Adam Rutherford? The Great Company and Youthful Worthies controversy? What seems to have marked all Epiphany controversies? Why is this so?

(11) Why were the trumpet alarms sounded? Why was the first alarm sounded? What resulted? What are typed by the three tribes to the east of the tabernacle? What was the antitype of the first alarm? How did it affect the three involved denominations? Why was the second alarm blown? What resulted? What are typed by the three tribes to the south of the tabernacle? What is the antitype of the second alarm? How did it affect the three pertinent tribes? What is not specifically mentioned as to the third and fourth alarms? Why was this not done? What directly implies their sounding? Indirectly? Why was the third alarm blown? What resulted? What are typed by the three tribes to the west of the tabernacle? What is the antitype of the third alarm? How did it affect the involved tribes? Why was the fourth alarm blown? What resulted? What are typed by the three tribes to the north of the tabernacle? What is the antitype of the fourth alarm?

How did it affect the pertinent tribes? What is a summary of these antitypes for these tribes? What is the antitypical thought of vs. 5 and 6?

(12) What contrast is brought to our attention in v. 7? What is emphasized in v. 7, positively and negatively? What is typically presented in v. 7? When are we, and when are we not to resort to controversy? Why should controversy not ordinarily be used? What are we to avoid, if we are to win others? If we wish to repel, what should we use? What is normally the best way to spread the Truth? Where is this testified by our Pastor? What is the proper use of controversy? For what is it not so good? What method is there more successful? What homely proverb embodies this truth? In what forms of service should we avoid controversy? What should we use therein? In what forms of service should we use controversy? Why? How may we summarize the antitypical teachings of v. 7?

(13) Whose was the privilege of blowing the trumpets, type and antitype? By whom was the antitypical blowing begun in each epoch of the Church? Which member of each star began it? What exception is there to this rule? Who began it in the Church of Ephesus? Why was this exception made? How did St. Peter do this? Who were seven of the principal men of the seven churches? What are the seven churches? What did the last six of these principal men do as to the symbolic blowing? How many were there in the stars between the Harvests? How many special helpers did they have? How many were there of these two kinds of servants? How can we prove this number of them to be true? Who followed each of these sets of two in the trumpeting?

(14) What set of brethren well illustrate this? How was it with John Wessel, his special helper and others? Savonarola, etc.? Luther, etc.? Zwingli, etc.? What differences in the message of each of these? What in common did all of them stress? Their different work toward the crown-lost leaders and the people? How long did such trumpeting continue? Where have we seen this thing work?

(15) Of what does v. 9 treat? Against what is the Christian warfare waged? Against whose leadership? In what particulars? What do these enemies do to the New

Creature? What are they numerically? What does their oppression of the New Creature make it do? Where do these enemies oppress us? What is the Gospel-Age Canaan? What are the antitypes of the inhabitants of Canaan? Where do the Truth and its Spirit dwell? What part of these is inhabited by antitypical Israelites? Antitypical Canaanites? What, accordingly, is the battle ground of the Spirit? What are Satan, the flesh and the world seeking to do through the antitypical inhabitants of Canaan? What are the involved armies? Who are in command of the antitypical Israelites? What are the issues at stake? On what is the outcome dependent?

(16) As what was the alarm-blowing a pledge? What is a good example of this? Of what is Num. 31 a type? Phinehas? Phinehas' alarm-blowing? What did the antitypical alarm-blowing effect? What were our Pastor's activities in the other phases of the reaping's warfare? What did he do as to the warfare against sin? By what means did he do this? How did the brethren thereby obtain the victory? What did he do as to the warfare against selfishness? By what means? How did the brethren thereby gain the victory? How were the pertinent truths put, in order to make them the antitypical trumpet alarms? What did our Pastor do as to the warfare against worldliness? By what means did he do it? How did the brethren thereby gain the victory?

(17) What pledge did God give Israel in v. 9? On what condition? What does this type? How may the Hebrew expression translated, "before the Lord," also be rendered? How may the former expression be understood? The latter? Why can the thought of the second rendering be realized? In what does this result? In what aspects of the fight? What fact proves this? What is replete with such examples? When especially? What conditions the proportions of the victory? The defeats? For whose defeats as Little Flock members will this account? For whose else defeats? How will they later dispose themselves? In whose else experience is this illustrated? For whose utter defeat will this principle account?

(18) What is readily concluded from the preceding discussion? What do we do in singing Hymn No. 24? From what will this become all the more apparent? Apart from

war, marches and assemblies, how many other occasions were there for trumpet blowing? What were they? In connection with what sacrifices? What were the festivals mentioned? How many new moons were there? Which one of them was a festival? What were the days of gladness? What are some examples of these? What did the burnt-offerings represent? The peace-offerings? How during the Gospel Age has God manifested His acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice?

(19) What does the Sabbath type? What does the Passover of Nisan 14 type for the Gospel Age? The seven days of the Passover festival? Pentecost? The new moon day of the seventh month? The atonement day? The festival of tabernacles? The new moons? The days of gladness?

(20) Accordingly, what do the typical festivals, new moons and days of gladness represent? What does Jesus minister in connection with their antitypes? What does blowing the trumpets over these two kinds of sacrifice type? Over the burnt-and peace-offerings of the Sabbath? Of the Passover of Nisan 14? Of the seven days' Passover festival? Of Pentecost?

(21) Of the annual seventh new moon? Of the day of atonement? Of the festival of tabernacles? Of the new moons? Of the days of gladness? What does doing this blowing always in the antitype in connection with the antitypical burnt-and peace-offerings mean? How may it otherwise be worded? What is the intended lesson? What should we do as to the sentiment of Hymn No. 24?

(22) What is recorded in Num. 10: 11-36? With what two other Scriptures especially is this account related? How is it related to these? What shows this? What is required for an understanding of the antitypes of vs. 11-36? What will follow from that requirement's being understood? Of what are these three Scriptures a good illustration? How does Is. 28: 10, 13 show this of the Bible? Is. 28: 11, 12, of the Lord's people?

(23) On what date did the departure from Sinai occur? When did it occur relatively to the end of the first annual Passover festival? When did the latter end? What does a comparison of v. 11 with Num. 9: 11 prove? Why? If not, what would it have required God to have done? How

long in time was the first journey from Sinai? What is alternatively implied by journeying the 21st of the second month? Which alternative seems very likely incorrect? Why? What is typed by the expression, "the wilderness of Sinai"? What led antitypical Israel out of it? Who in the type on this occasion bore the ark? Who ordinarily bore it? How do the cited passages prove this? What disproves their doing it on this occasion? Since both the ark and the cloud then led the host, how were they related? How do the cited passages prove that extraordinarily priests bore the ark? So doing, what do they type? How does their bearing it type this?

(24) On how many one-thousand-year days does the Gospel Age touch? What two facts prove that the three days of the first journey type the Gospel Age? Why? What does this time feature enable us to do? What, in other words, does this first journey type? How does this fact stand related, negatively and positively, with Numbers' other Gospel-Age antitypes? What are some examples of particularized Gospel-Age antitypes? General Gospel-Age antitypes? What do the facts shown in this paragraph enable us to do? What two things lend confirmation to this as to the start of the antitype? How does v. 34 directly state this of the typical start? What two facts prove this for the end of this antitypical first journey?

(25) What is given in v. 12? How long did this journey last? How far was it from Sinai to Paran? What does this distance suggest as its being a three-days' journey? What did these three days measure? What is not, and what is to be inferred from no mention of stops in this journey? What does the word *Sinai* mean and here type? *Paran*? What is typed by the cloud resting in Paran on the third day? According to what did Israel take this first march? What does this type? Why did God approve of the antitypical tribes' taking their journey? What bearing has Ps. 45: 9 on this thought? What does this passage mean? Why are the denominations called kings' daughters? What is typed by Israel's making this journey at the hand of Moses?

(26) Why must another matter be discussed before vs. 14-28 be studied? What thought naturally arises on reading the time order of the typical tribes' starting on their

journeyings? What understanding prevents such a view being entertained? How is this shown from the examples of the Calvinistic, Greek Catholic, Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches in relation to the tribes typing them? What, accordingly, is not the order herein shown? Wherein does this hold and wherein does it not hold true? What antitypical tribe is no exception to the second rule? Why not? What, then, is the order maintained in the antitype? What was the figure on the standard of Judah's camp? What does this figure prefigure? On that of Reuben's camp? What does this prefigure? On that of Ephraim's camp? What does this prefigure? On that of Dan's camp? What does this prefigure? Why in each case did the figure prefigure the respective attribute?

(27) Accordingly, what did the figures type? What does this prepare us to see? What will show this? What did Judah represent? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the thought central to that doctrine? How do the cited Scriptures show this? What does Issachar type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How does the cited Scripture show this? What does Zebulun type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How does this cited Scripture prove this? What, therefore, is the central thought of the antitypical camp to the east? What will an examination of the antitypical camp to the south reveal on this point? What does Reuben type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How does the cited passage prove this? What does Simeon type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How do the cited verses prove it? What does Gad type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How does the cited passage prove this? What conclusion is to be drawn from this discussion as to the antitypical camp to the south?

(28) What does Ephraim type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How does the cited Scripture prove it? What does Manasseh type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How does the cited Scripture prove this? What does Benjamin type?

What it its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How does the cited Scripture prove it? What follows as to the central thought of the antitypical camp to the west? What does Dan type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How do the cited passages prove this? What does Asher type? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How do the cited verses prove this? What is typed by Naphtali? What is its stewardship doctrine? What is the central thought of that doctrine? How do the cited verses prove this? What follows as to the central thought of the antitypical camp to the north? What does our examination prove, negatively and positively? As to the three tribes in each camp as to time? Which antitypical tribe is no real exception to this rule?

(29) What journeyed first, according to v. 14? What does this type? Why is this true? How in order of development do the three pertinent doctrines stand related? Why does the Lord's Supper doctrine come the first of the three? In what two ways does it come first? What enables us to see the relations of the crown-lost leaders', the Little Flock members' and the sectarian church activities to the antitypical marching? What will be done in explaining each tribal journeying? Why? With what antitypical tribe does our study begin? What does Judah mean and type? What are the two names of the Calvinistic Church? Who began to announce the Reformation Truth on the Lord's Supper? Of what did this truth consist? What not understood implication lay in the third feature of the Lord's Supper? What was the effect of Zwingli's proclamation of this truth? How long did it remain a Little Flock movement?

(30) What happened to this movement? Under whose leadership? When? Who became his associates? What did they produce? Where is this work detailedly described? Relatively, what is the size of the Calvinistic Church? At what point did the journeying of antitypical Judah set in? What does Judah's starting out under Nahshon's leadership type? Against what two errors on the Lord's Supper did they wage controversy? What was its defensive part? Offensive part? In this controversy

what two uses of the Bible did they employ? What was the effect of this? What constructive uses of the Lord's Supper did they make? How, each in itself and all relatively, did they employ these four uses of the Bible? How are these typed? How do the warriors and the other Judahites stand typically related to these four uses of the Bible by the members of the Calvinistic Church? In this activity what did they vindicate?

(31) What was the second tribe of Judah's camp? What does its name mean? Who was its leader? What does his name mean? His father's name? What was the antitype of this tribe? Who was the Little Flock member who started the movement later perverted into the Campbellite Church? What was his special teaching? When and where did he begin it? Of what was he a member? Who was his special helper companion? Where and when did he start his special work? Who joined them in proclaiming their message? In what did this result? Of what was this work a fulfillment? Who began to sectarianize this movement? Who supported him in this sectarian work? What was the outcome of their work? What was it that started out the crown-lost leaders on their work of offering? As what did they march? How did they start in antitypical Issachar's march? What followed their offering? What is typed by the non-leaders of Issachar starting their journeying? What four things in these is implied in the Issacharites' marching? What degree of use did they thereby make of their stewardship doctrine? What effect did this have on others? What did they thereby do as to God's power?

(32) What was the third tribe in Judah's camp? What does this name mean? Who was its prince? What do his and his father's names mean? What does this tribe type? Who initiated the movement later perverted into the Adventist Church? When? What was his special teaching? What did this doctrine emphasize? What was the character of his message? How long did he minister it? Why did he blow an alarm? By what other method did he sound his trumpet? Who was the second member of the two of whom William Miller was the star-member? Who joined them in their pertinent message? In what did this result? Who joined them as crown-lost leaders? When?

What did they do with the Miller movement? Where are details thereon given? Of whom were they the antitype? What did their use of the pertinent doctrine do? In what ways did they offer this teaching? What resulted? How did their followers use this stewardship doctrine? How especially? What did this antitype? By their fourfold use of this doctrine what did they advance and vindicate?

(33) What does v. 17 show? How did they come to journey there? What two things make this the logical place for them? Who partook in the antitypical Gershonites' work? In that of the antitypical Merarites? Where is this shown in detail? What was the antitypical Libnite Gershonites' work? That of the antitypical Shimite Gershonites? In doing so, for what did they stand? What did their serving the justification features of God's plan make them do? What does this prove of their position as symbolic marchers? What did the Shimite Gershonites' work make them do? What does this prove of their position as symbolic marchers?

(34) What will manifest the logical order of the Merarites' march? What in general were the antitypical Merarites in their office work? For what purpose were they such agents? Through what services of the antitypical Gershonites and Kohathites did they not minister? What were such services of the Gershonites? Kohathites? What were the antitypical Merarites' service to the antitypical Gershonites? Antitypical Kohathites? What do the facts in the preceding paragraph showing the antitypical Gershonites' logical place in the journeying prove as to the related works of the antitypical Merarites? How did they minister to the Kohathites as to furthering Divine power and wisdom? What do these considerations prove as to the antitypical Gershonites and Merarites? What is typed by the Gershonites' taking down their parts of the tabernacle? The antitypical Libnites? The antitypical Shimites? The antitypical Mahlites? The antitypical Mushites? What is typed by the Gershonites' bearing their parts of the tabernacle? The Merarites'? What is typed by their setting forth on their journeying?

(35) What does v. 18 introduce? What was the second camp called? What did its standard bear? What does

the eagle type? How was its antitype related to the second antitypical camp? What, according to Num. 2: 2, did each tribe have in addition to what each camp had? As what did the four standards not serve? As what did they serve? The twelve ensigns? To what did they stand related? What did both of these type? How are these twelve graces further symbolized? How was the tribe of Reuben related to the second camp? What did this tribe type? What is its stewardship doctrine?

(36) Who started the movement that was perverted into the Greek Catholic Church? What teaching started this movement? In opposition to what, and what phase of it? What does Polycarp say of John and Cerinthus? Wherein does St. John set forth the pertinent doctrine? What were his thoughts thereon? As an Apostle, despite being also a member of the Smyrna star, what did St. John not have that the other star-members of the five churches between the Harvests did have? Why? Who was Polycarp? What were some of his privileges? With whom, and in what was he joined? When? Who was his special helper companion? On what other subject also? Who else joined these in this message? What did their united efforts effect? Who next appeared on the scene? What did they woefully pervert? What did they uphold? Who were these and what was the time that each flourished? In what did their work result? What did their offering their antitypical bowl, charger and spoon start, according to the type under study? Whom did they attract? Into what? How did these join in antitypical Reuben's journeying? By what four uses of the stewardship doctrine? What kind of a warfare did they thereby wage? What kind of a constructive work did they do? What did they thereby accomplish? Where will details on the offering of the crown-lost leaders of the Greek Catholic Church be found?

(37) Of what does v. 19 treat? What does the word *Simeon* mean? What was his camp and his place in it? Who was his prince? What do the names *Shelumiel* and *Zurishaddai* mean? What does the tribe of Simeon type? By what was his journeying preceded? Who started to blow this symbolic alarm? Whose disciple was he? What occasioned his alarm-sounding? What thoughts did he

oppose to their teachings? What can be said of his teaching at that time? What cannot be said of it now? Why? What truth did the conditions lead Irenaeus to set forth? What did he do with this truth? Who was Irenaeus' helper companion? What did he do? Who joined these two in the antitypical trumpeting? What accompanied and resulted from such trumpeting? What was the truth that they proclaimed? Who were the crown-lost leaders who perverted this Little Flock movement? What was the relative prominence of these various leaders in their perverting work? Into what did they pervert this Little Flock movement? Who were the two greatest chiefs in this work? Which of these was the chief therein? By what did these as the antitype of Shelumiel, the son of Zurishaddai, start out in the journeying of antitypical Simeon? Who attached themselves to these as members of the Roman Catholic Church? How did they start out in the antitypical journeying? Continue therein? What mistake did this whole sectarian aggregation make? Where are details on this subject? What did antitypical Simeon advance and vindicate by his journeying? In what respect?

(38) Of what does v. 20 treat? What was Gad's order in the camp of Reuben? Who was his prince? What do the words *Gad*, *Eliasaph* and *Deuel* mean? What does Gad type? Eliasaph? Who were the main crown-lost leaders of antitypical Gad? Who was the Little Flock leader who initiated the pertinent movement? About when? What was his alarm? Who was Cranmer's helper companion? How were they as a set of twos related to each other? Who joined these in the trumpet blowing? What accompanied and resulted in such activity? By whom was this Little Flock movement in part sectarianized? Under what mistaken impression? By whom was the real sectarianizing primarily wrought? Secondarily? How did they as antitypical Eliasaph start out on the antitypical journeying? Where are details thereon found? Who joined these in the antitypical march? How did they do this? What is typed by Gad's progress in his journeying? What by these activities did they advance and vindicate? In what respect? What does the foregoing discussion demonstrate as to the three tribes to the antitypical Tabernacle's south?

(39) What did the three days' journey of Num. 10: 11-36 type? Who led the antitypical march? How? Who logically, but not chronologically, followed them? Who followed these? Who came next? After them? How about the rest? What preceded every camp's journeying? Viewed chronologically, what preceded each tribe's journeying? Why in each case did the tribal journey follow the priestly movement? What was the order in each tribal journey? What character do these considerations give the type of Num. 10: 11-36? Where are we now as to the antitypical march? What will the Priests soon have done as to this march? What will have searched out this resting place? For whom? What period will end the Priests' march? Who will shortly thereafter end their part in this march? Who shortly thereafter? With what will the end of the Gospel Age be accompanied? What occurs in the tribal picture during this miniature Gospel Age? When will the larger tribes pass away? What will take their place? What in this connection is not shown in the type? Why? Why should this point be kept in mind?

(40) What part of the section under study was ended in paragraph (38)? What does v. 21 describe? What was their position in the marching host? What was the negative and positive character of this position? What proves this in a general way? As to the Priests, tribal leaders, Levites and Israelites? What conclusion results from these considerations?

(41) How does this affect the position of the antitypical Kohathites? What is the fourfold work of the Gospel-Age Kohathites? What, accordingly, do they furnish the antitypical Priests? As what? How was their service to these rendered as to the upper part of the Ark? As to the Laver? How did their service further the Priests as to the antitypical vessels? Beside the Priests, whom else did they thereby help? What is typed by the Kohathites' marching in the center of the host? Where is the work of the Gospel-Age Kohathites explained? How did they antitype the Kohathites' marching as described in v. 21? What is typed by the Gershonites' doing their part of erecting the tabernacle before the Kohathites' arrival? The Merarites' doing their part in it?

(42) What did prior printed Greek and Hebrew recensions

help later Gershonite Amramite Kohathites to do? What examples as to Greek recensions prove this? What remarks as to Mr. Panin's Numeric Testament should here be made? To what mistakes has neighborhood numerics betrayed him? What do these examples prove? In whose else work does this same principle manifest itself? Whose work from the standpoint of this principle is somewhat alike? How are these matters related? How is the operation of this principle shown in connection with the antitypical Merarites' erecting their parts of the antitypical Tabernacle?

(43) What is typed by the Kohathites' being in the center of the host? How does this antitype show their work relations toward the Priests? What did they thereby offer them? What else showed this? How were their relations to the crown-lost leaders shown in the type? How were the latter until 1917 regarded by God? What proves this? Despite what? Generally speaking, of what nature did their help for the antitypical Israelites not consist? Of what did it consist? What works illustrate this? For what other reason were the typical Kohathites placed in the center of the host? What were the antitypical Kohathites' various works? From the viewpoint of the second reason for their logical position, to what did they minister? How were they represented? In what respects? How can the second reason be summarized?

(44) Into what position does the foregoing discussion put us? What facts already given prove the logical more than the time order as applying in the antitypical march? What other set of facts are in line with this? As to time order, by what was each denominational journeying preceded? To what did such alarms lead? What later set in? What followed still later? If the time order of the pertinent events were intended to have been typed, how would the priests have been represented? How were they actually represented? What negative reason prevented the former representation? What four positive reasons did God have in adjusting the type as He did? How did the priests bearing the ark show the time relation, as viewed from the standpoint of the picture viewed as a whole? What details does it not give? What does the alarm-blowing for the four camps prove?

(45) In what relative time order do the antitypical Levites in each denomination do their work? The antitypical Gershonites? The antitypical Merarites? The antitypical Kohathites? What time relations in their work are not purposed to be brought out in this type? What is the purpose in these respects? As distinct from what? What is ignored in this type? Why, as to the antitypical Priests? As to the antitypical Levites? What, accordingly, is the order as respects the antitypical Levites? To what order does the entire picture more largely lean? What, however, is not entirely ignored? In what respects?

(46) What does v. 22 bring to our attention? What Divine attribute is typed in the camp of Ephraim? Where was this shown as to the camp as a whole and the three involved stewardship doctrines? What will now be in order? By what was the start of the Lutheran Church preceded? What were the four fundamental doctrines of the Reformation? Who was the one who trumpeted the stewardship doctrine of the Lutheran Church? What other three doctrines did he trumpet? What was his chiefly stressed doctrine? Against what did he stress all four, especially his chiefly stressed one? Why did he chiefly stress it? What was the ultimate reason for it? How was it trumpeted? How as to controversial effectiveness does Luther rank? What effect did this have on Rome's estimate of him? What proves that his trumpeting was seasonable? Why did he greatly love the doctrine of justification by faith alone? What is his ablest and most detailed exposition of this doctrine? What is its rank?

(47) What was the effect of Luther's nailing the 95 theses on the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg? For what four principles did he wage invincible warfare? What methods did he reject? As what did he fight? For what was he loved? How does he rank as a genius? Who was his ablest antagonist? Who was his chief assistant? How were Luther and he in character contrasted? What is displayed in their being made complements of one another? Who shortly rallied to their side? What was their special message? Who a little later joined them? What did they do and effect? What did their offerings antitype? Who were gathered to these crown-lost leaders? What did they do? What did their pertinent activities antitype?

What did their continuing them antitype? What will their ending them antitype? What did these activities further and vindicate?

(48) What tribe marched next in the type? Who was its leader? What do the words, Manasseh, Gamaliel and Pedahzur, mean? What does this tribe type? What is its stewardship doctrine? Against what did it revolt? What Divine attribute did it emphasize? Against what church's lordship did it contend? How was such lording manifested? Who revolted against it? Of what is the episcopacy a gross corruption? With what views did Robert Browne combat it? Into what did this plunge him? Upon what condition was he received again into the Church of England? What was his antitypical alarm?

(49) Who seems to have been his companion helper? What things did they together do? What were Harrison's main sole activities? Of what was their joint activity the antitype? Who shortly joined their agitation? What is given and what is omitted in No. 100? Who then shortly joined them? What did they do and effect? On what did their offering their bowl, charger and spoon start them? In what did this result? What did these Congregationalists do? What did they draw to themselves? In beginning their controversies, what did they antitype? What, in continuing them? What will their ending them antitype? What did their course accomplish as to Justice? Where are details given on the pertinent priestly and crown-lost leaders' activities?

(50) What was the last tribe of the third camp? Who was its prince? What do the words, Benjamin, Abidan and Gideoni, mean? Where are details on typical and antitypical Benjamin given? Whom does Benjamin as a tribe about the tabernacle type? What is their stewardship doctrine? Of what is it a summary? What is its essence? How is this related to the camp on the antitypical west of the Tabernacle? What evils in the Church of England occasioned the Little Flock movement later perverted into Quakerism? Who was the Little Flock brother who began to sound the pertinent alarm? From whom must he be distinguished? What position among English books does Foxe's Acts and Monuments of the Martyrs hold? Where could George Fox find no religious

satisfaction? Wherein did he search for it for years? Wherein did he find it? Thereupon what did he do?

(51) Who was his companion helper? What are the two most famous Quaker writings? How did Fox and Barclay complement one another as two secondarily prophets? Who soon joined them in alarm-trumpeting? What were their fields of labor? Who were the chiefs of the crown-lost leaders that associated themselves with these Priests among the Quakers? Among other fanatical sects? In what did they join? What did this effect? In making their offerings, what did they antitype? Who were gathered to them? What did they do? In what was the spirit of their stewardship doctrine manifest? With what results? What is typed by their entering this course? Proceeding therewith? Ending it? What did they further and vindicate thereby? What remark made in this connection as to this tribe's families fits those of all the tribes?

(52) What does v. 25 introduce? What do the names, Dan, Ahiezer and Ammishaddai, mean? What is the thought common to the camp to the antitypical north? Whose sons were the progenitors of the three tribes on the tabernacle's north? How did these three antitypical tribes stand toward the Little Flock, relatively to the other nine? How does this fact stand related to their stewardship doctrines? To what does this remark particularly apply? Why not to the later journeying of the Unitario-Universalists? How was it as related to their earlier journeyings? Who began to issue as an alarm what became the Baptists' stewardship doctrine? What was that doctrine? Of what star was Hubmaier a member? What was the character of his abilities and works? With whom did he as a star-member become involved in controversy? What did his work effect?

(53) Who was his companion helper? Why was he so called? Where did the Hubmaier movement mainly center at first? What scattered it? Who stirred up their persecution? Where then did the movement largely move? Where did Blaurock thereafter work? Under what circumstances? Who joined these two in sounding the alarm? Against what error did they contend? Why? How did Satan seek to discredit the movement? Who then appeared among them? Who was their chief? What did they offer

and thereby antitype and accomplish? How is the stewardship doctrine of the Baptists an expression of disinterested love? By whom were the crown-lost leaders joined? How did they participate in the pertinent controversy? What else did they do with this stewardship doctrine? What did their beginning this course antitype? Their continuance therein? What will their ending it antitype? What was the relation of their course to God's attribute of Love? What do their persecutions at the hands of other sectarians antitype? Where are these matters given in detail?

(54) Of what does v. 26 treat? Who was Asher's prince? What do the words, Asher, Pagiel and Okran, mean? What does Asher type? How was Asher related to Leah? What is therein implied antitypically? What two things resulted therefrom? What caution against error is here given? What is the stewardship doctrine of the Methodist Church? What do they sometimes call it? How has their view frequently been misrepresented by opponents? What two things in part occasioned this? Who was the Little Flock member who began to trumpet this true doctrine? What two things occasioned his blowing this alarm? To develop such a condition and life, what did he stress? In what did his early efforts result, as to the ministers and the laity? What was his field of labor? In what did his tireless activities result? How long and by what methods did he labor as a star-member? Who of the star-members seem to have served longer as such? How long was their respective service? How did Wesley's character fit his stewardship doctrine?

(55) Who was his companion helper? How often do we meet fleshly brothers as star-members? Among whom were John and Charles Wesley as brothers unique? How does Charles rank as a hymn-writer? How numerous were his hymns? Which is one of his best? What did he do as to the alarm? Who joined John and Charles therein? How do they compare with the Priests of other Little Flock movements? How is this inferred? Who joined them at first? Later? In what did they join? What did they thereby antitype? Who were attracted by these? What did they do? How did they use their stewardship doctrine? What did they thereby antitype in the outstart?

Progress? Completion? What did they accomplish thereby? Where are details hereon given?

(56) Of what does v. 27 treat? Who was its prince? What do the words, Naphtali, Ahira and Enan, mean? What is the antitype of Naphtali? What was their stewardship doctrine? What truths did they hold against the four greatest nominal-church errors? What typical relation accounts for antitypical Naphtali having so much Truth? What must be said of its later doctrinal positions? What four great errors do they now hold? What evil eminence do these errors give them as a denomination? Who was the Little Flock leader that gave the alarm on the above-mentioned stewardship doctrine? What are some of the main events of his life before he was a star-member? Why did he have to exercise much secrecy as to his connection with his stewardship teaching? What did he do in 1531? In 1532? What reception did his book receive? What as a result did he do? What were the chief events in his life in France? What attitude did he have to take? When did he renew his controversy with Calvin? What did he do to Calvin in 1553? What things did this lead Calvin to do? What can be said of Servetus' use of his stewardship doctrine?

(57) Who was his companion helper? After the likeness of Thomas Campbell's relation to Barton Stone, and of J. Wolf's relation to William Miller, what were his relations and helps toward Servetus? Where did he begin to sound the alarm? What compelled him to change his field of labor to Switzerland? How did he there work? In antitype of what was his, Servetus' and their fellow Priests' hard course? What kind of a Priestly movement resulted? Who was Faustus Socinus? What were his chief pertinent acts? Where? What great contemporary joined him? Who were the greatest of such leaders in the last two centuries? What did all this do? In so doing, what did they antitype? Whom did they attract as followers? Into what? What did they then do? How did they do it? What did they thereby antitype in their outstart? Progress? Completion? What did they thereby accomplish as to Divine Love? Where are details on this matter found? What does v. 28 do as to vs. 11-27? Like as in what related set of acts is this done?

(58) When did the episode of vs. 29-32 occur? What four things prove this time feature? When did the departure from antitypical Sinai occur? What is typed by departing from Sinai? When, accordingly, must the antitype of the episode of vs. 29-32 have occurred? What is in harmony with this view? What does the word *Hobab* mean? What antitypically? What was his relationship to Moses? How do the cited Scriptures show this? How has the A. V. made confusion on this subject? How are Jethro, Reuel and Raguel identified? What remark should here be made? What does Moses' requesting Hobab to accompany Israel to Palestine type? In what two ways was the antitypical request made? How antitypically is Israel our Lord's brother-in-law? How does the Church as Jehovah's (class) daughter figure in this? Where is this in part set forth? What did our Lord seek through His ministry toward Israel while in the flesh? How did He sum up His pertinent ministry? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? By what did He seek their conversion? Why did He confine His ministry to Israel? What good did he directly do? How do the cited passages prove this? How else did He seek their conversion? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What types His and their elaborations of the high calling before Israel?

(59) What does Hobab's refusal type? In what two ways was the antitypical refusal given? How was it done in word? In act? Where are details thereon given by St. Paul? How do the facts of the case stand related to the type? What is typed by Hobab's saying that he would depart to his own land? To his own people? What facts prove this to have been done? During this course what have they experienced?

(60) Without what were they not allowed to take this course? In what two ways were these entreaties and remonstrances made? At what two times? Wherein are these set forth typically? How were they first expressed typically? Of what words does this typical expression remind us? More particularly? Of whose others? Where given? Why did Moses offer Hobab the honorable role of guide? What does this type? What does Hobab in his knowledge of the wilderness type? Like whose helps for the Church were those that Israel could have given

Spiritual Israel? Why was such an invitation offered? What proves the answer? Where is the emphasized typical appeal found? How is the strong emphasis shown in the appeal? What does this type? Why did Jesus and His mouthpieces make such appeals? What is typed by Moses' offering Hobab the same treatment as Israel would receive, after Hobab's refusal? What is surely an antitype of the offer of v. 32? What is typed by Hobab's refusal grieving Moses? Despite their fall, over what should we rejoice? Of what is the Hobab episode another confirmation?

(61) What has already been done with v. 33? In what connections? What does this warrant at this place? How do these remarks apply as to v. 34? What is proven by the fact that it was the pillar of cloud, not of fire, that started the journey out of the wilderness of Sinai? What other considerations strengthen this proof? What views of the antitypical marching and camping are corroborated by Moses' prayers in vs. 35 and 36? Amid what is progress mainly made? How is this related antitypically to Moses' prayer in v. 35? For what two things is the prayer antitypically? What two things does Jesus seek in the antitypical prayer of v. 35? What is the defensive part of the Christian warfare? What temporarily is not made during our endurances? For what does Jesus, then, pray? Why is there special pertinency to such a prayer at antitypical Paran? What kind of a return will it be? What two things do we end with this study? During the course of this, what other chapter of Num. did we study? In what connection? What have we thereby accomplished? What is a brief summary of this involved part of Numbers, type and antitype? What should we do Godward in view of these studies?

Onward, Christian soldiers! Marching as to war,
  With the cross of Jesus, going on before;
Christ, the royal Master, leads against the foe;
  Forward into battle, see His banner go!
Onward, then, ye people, join our happy throng,
  Blend with ours your voices in the triumph song;
Glory, laud and honor unto Christ, the King,
  This through countless ages men and angels sing.